

E 184
.F8 A95
Copy 1

THE
INFLUENCE OF FRENCH IMMIGRATION
ON THE
POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.

A Thesis for the Doctor's Degree, University of Minnesota.

BY ELIZABETH H. AVERY.

THE
INFLUENCE OF FRENCH IMMIGRATION
ON THE
POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.

[A Thesis for the Doctor's Degree, University of Minnesota.]

BY ELIZABETH H. AVERY.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Introduction.	9
The Huguenots:	
1. Huguenot Settlements.....	11
2. The Revolutionary Period.....	18
3. The Treaty of Peace.....	23
4. State Constitutions.....	27
5. The National Constitution.....	29
6. The Early Days of the Constitution.....	33
The French Catholics:	
1. The Old Northwest.....	44
2. The Louisiana Purchase.....	55
Comparison and Conclusion.....	60
Appendix.....	66
Bibliography	70

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE investigation of which the results are herewith presented was begun with the thought of preparing a paper for the Seminary of American History in the University of Minnesota. A very brief survey sufficed to show that here was a field, practically unworked, intensely fascinating, and of no small importance. The study was therefore continued and the paper was expanded to the present limits.

At no stage of the research, have I consciously labored to establish a pre-conceived theory. Indeed, in the main, the results reached are far other than I should have anticipated. The conclusions of a first effort in a new field are necessarily somewhat tentative, and I shall be quite satisfied if the results of this study shall lead others, better equipped, to continue the investigation, whether the final results agree with those here reached or not.

INTRODUCTION.

The formerly accepted theory that American institutions are almost exclusively of Anglo-Saxon origin, has of late been vigorously attacked. In particular, large claims to a share in the honor of building the American nation have been asserted on behalf of the Dutch.¹ Whatever the final judgment of sober historical criticism on such claims may be, it is evident that much is to be gained by careful study of the influence of other than English-speaking peoples on the origin and development of our institutions. Such a study in regard to the early French settlers will be attempted in this paper.

At the outset we are confronted by the fact that, in the main, these settlers fall into two groups: the French Protestants, mostly refugees from persecution at home, who came to the Atlantic colonies; and the French Catholics, who, coming for purposes of traffic or sent by a paternal government, founded settlements in the "old Northwest" and the Mississippi valley. For clearness of treatment, it seems best to study separately the effect of these two streams of immigration, and then to compare their influence.

¹Especially in Douglas Campbell's work, "The Puritan in England, Holland, and America." W. E. Griffiths, also, asserts that we borrowed from the Netherlands, "in germ or directly," eighteen features of our government. Among them are the separation of church and state, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, the supreme court, the common school system, etc. See *National Magazine*, vol. XV., p. 603.

I. HUGUENOTS.

I. HUGUENOT SETTLEMENTS.

HUGUENOT immigration to this country began at a very early period. It would, however, be quite beside my present purpose to relate the story of the ill-fated colonies sent out by Coligny, or even to give in detail the accounts of more successful undertakings in later years. I shall attempt only a brief summary, in the order of colonies rather than in chronological order, of the settlements made by them in the United States.

It appears that while the Pilgrims tarried in Leyden, friendly relations sprang up between them and some of the French refugees who were also settled there, for the Mayflower brought among its passengers certain Huguenots, Philip Delanoy and Wm. Molines with his wife, son, and daughter,¹ the latter of whom has been immortalized by one of her own descendants as the "*Puritan maiden Priscilla*" Mullins.

In 1662, the General Court of Massachusetts granted to John Touthon, a physician of Rochelle, and other French Protestants expelled on account of their faith, permission to settle in the colony.² Within the next quarter of a century these were followed by quite a large number of their countrymen. Soon after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the proprietors of a tract of land in the Nipmuck country invited some thirty of them thither and made them a grant of eleven or twelve thousand acres. The village of Oxford which they founded flourished for a time but was abandoned in 1704 on ac-

¹J. C. Hotten, *Original Lists of Emigrants to America*, Introduction, p. XXV., and C. W. Baird, *Huguenot Emigration to America*, I., 154 and 158. All the Molines family except the daughter died during the first winter.

²Mass. Col. Records, vol. IV., part II., p. 67. See also, *Memorial Hist. of Boston*, II., 250, where it is stated that Touthon came over in 1675 and that the first considerable company came in 1686. Cites MS. copy of Council Records in the office of Sec. of State, p. 52.

count of Indian massacres, the inhabitants going to Boston and other places.¹

Some forty or fifty families made a settlement, which they called Frenchtown, in East Greenwich, Rhode Island, in the autumn of 1686. Owing to disputes about land titles, these settlers were afterwards scattered over the Narragansett country. After the Revolution many of them moved to Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania and thence farther west.²

In the latter part of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, Connecticut received a small accession of Huguenots who located mostly in Milford and Hartford.³

Huguenot settlements were made in New York earlier than elsewhere. Indeed there is evidence that the first white child born in that region, in 1614 or 1615, was of Huguenot parentage.⁴ In 1623, a Dutch ship brought over nearly thirty Walloon families, some of whom settled on Manhattan Island, others near the present site of Philadelphia, and still others at Fort Orange—now Albany. There was considerable desultory migration before the Revocation and settlements were formed on both Staten Island and Long Island.⁵

In 1677, several families from the Palatinate located west of the Hudson and in grateful commemoration of their previous place of refuge called their village New Paltz.⁶

New Rochelle, Westchester Co., was settled in 1689, the land

¹Daniels, *Hist. of Oxford*, p. 19; *Mass. Hist. Coll.* vol. XXII., p. 29; C. W. Baird gives lists of French settlers in Mass. from a variety of original sources.

²Baird, II., 291, ff.; Potter, *History of French Settlements and Settlers in Rhode Island*, pp. 17, 18, 88, and 89. This little book contains copies of original documents and is very valuable for the study of this settlement.

³Huguenot Emigration to America, II., 330, ff. The authorities seem to be genealogical records.

⁴Memorial Hist. of N. Y., I., 144, 145; Coll. of Huguenot Soc. of N. Y., I., *Introd.*, p. X. and footnote. Both refer to the Journal of Labadist voyagers, Dankers and Sluyter, whose date was about 1679.

⁵Doc. Hist. of N. Y., III., 35; Huguenot Emigration to America, I., 170; Coll. of Huguenot Soc., I., *Introd.* pp. XIV. and XV.

⁶Coll. of Ulster Hist. Soc. vol. I. part I. p. 34. There had been Walloon settlers in that region previously. See Huguenot Coll. I., *introd.* XIV. The Walloons were people of French extraction living in the region now comprised in the department du Nord and the S. W. provinces of Belgium. The Protestants among them were practically Huguenots. See Huguenot Emigration to America, I., 149-151 and Huguenot Coll., I. *Introd* X., footnote.

having been purchased from Leisler. The settlers were from the city which figures so largely in Huguenot history.¹

Many refugees who went first to the West Indies came thence to New York.²

Individual families located here and there in New Jersey—a little group of them near Princeton—but the first and probably the only settlement looking to permanence was that on the Hackensack. This was begun in 1677 under the leadership of David Demarest, a native of Picardy, who on coming to America first joined a Huguenot colony on Staten Island and later was a prominent citizen of New Harlem. The colony prospered, tract after tract of land was added, and before the Revolution it sent emigrants to Western New York, to Adams Co., Pennsylvania, and to Harrod's Station, Kentucky.³

French immigrants came also to Delaware, to Berks Co., Pennsylvania, possibly to Maryland, and in much larger numbers to Virginia.⁴ Some came to the latter colony as early as 1660, perhaps earlier. Between 1690 and 1700, the arrivals amounted in all to "700 or 800 men, women, and children, who had fled from France on account of their religion." Their principal settlement was at Manakintown, about twenty miles above the falls of the James River. From this place many of them moved to more desirable lands on the Trent River in North Carolina.⁵

Charles II. sent a colony of French Protestants at his own expense to South Carolina in 1679. During the reign of James

¹Doc. Hist. of N. Y., III., 955, ff. C W. Baird has an interesting note in *Mag. of Am. Hist.*, II., 493, ff., in which he argues that Leisler was a Huguenot and hence especially interested in locating these families. Cf. on this point Huguenot Coll., I. *Intro.*, XXVI., footnote and the references there given.

²N. Y. Col. Doc., IX., 309.

³These and other interesting particulars may be found in "The Huguenots on the Hackensack," an address delivered before the Huguenot Soc. by Rev. Dr. Demarest, a descendant of the founder. It is published in Vol. I. of the proceedings of the Soc. and also separately in pamphlet form.

⁴Huguenot Coll. I., XIV., Huguenot Emigration to America, I., 133, ff., Rupp, *Thirty Thousand Names of Emigrants to Penn.*, pp. XVI. and XVIII., and Talcott *Gen. Notes of N. Y. and New Eng.*, 80.

⁵The introduction to vol. V. of the Va. Hist. Coll. states that the names of record in the State Land Registry indicate desultory Walloon immigration early in the 17th century. See also Mead, *Old Churches and Families of Va.*, I., 463, ff.; Rupp, 362; C. L. Hunter, *Sketches of Western N. Car.*, 6; and Beverly, *Histoire De la Virginie*, 188, ff. and 380, ff.

II., collections were made for them in England, Parliament at one time granting them aid. Their early settlements were chiefly near the Santee and Cooper rivers. In 1730 the Purysburg settlement was made. In 1761 the Assembly of the colony passed an act for encouraging foreign Protestants to settle there, which had the effect to bring over six hundred persons in about three years. The Abbeville District seems to have been settled by these later comers.¹

Besides these more important settlements to which I have called attention, there were separate families or small groups of families who came over at various times. The Huguenot Society of America recognizes fourteen "original settlements." New York City, Staten Island, Long Island, New Rochelle, New Paltz, Boston, New Oxford, Narragansetts, Maine, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, and Florida. As I have shown, nearly all the thirteen colonies received, at some time before the Revolution, at least a few Huguenot settlers.

It is probably impossible to ascertain with any approach to accuracy how large a part of the population they formed. Palfrey says that one hundred and fifty families came to New England after the Revocation, and Baird considers this estimate too low.² Moreover there had been considerable immigration to that colony at an earlier date, as we have seen. One writer holds that the number who came before the Revocation was much greater than has been supposed, and estimates that in 1670 the Huguenots were one-fourth the population of New York. Another states that 17,000 has been mentioned as a probable number in South Carolina.³ And the historian of those who settled on the Hackensack says: "Historians * * know nothing of a Huguenot element as a factor of any importance" in New Jersey. "But suppose that you were today to remove * * all who bear the names of the original Huguenot settlers on the Hackensack, and of those who soon after located in the neighborhood * * you would vacate a very

¹Transactions of the Huguenot Soc. of S. Car., I., 10, 12, 15, II., 55, III., 65 and 66; Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., XXII, 35; S. Car. Hist. Soc. Coll. I., 100, ff. (The French Protestants of the Abbeville District); Holmes, Annals, I., 394, 453, 460, 472, and 489; and Lee, Huguenots in France and America, II., 72 and 73.

²Palfrey, Hist. of New Eng., I., preface p. VIII.; C. W. Baird, II., 202.

³See Mag. Am. Hist. IX., 295, (an article by Rev. A. V. Wittmeyer, rector of the French church Saint Esprit); and Trans. Huguenot Soc. S. Car., III, 37.

large proportion of the houses and farms in an extensive district. And if, in addition, you were to remove all who, though bearing Dutch names, have quite as much French as Dutch blood in their veins, you would create a wilderness almost without inhabitants." * * * *

Whatever may be thought of such estimates, the indications are that they were a larger element of the colonial population than we are accustomed to think. At all events they were sufficiently numerous to make it a matter of interest and importance to determine how far and in what ways they influenced national development.

A people so industrious, thrifty, and religious would be expected to have a beneficial influence upon the economic and moral life of the colonies, and the course of contemporary evidence as well as the results of later investigations point in that direction. It is quite likely, as suggested by some writers, that their more genial type of piety may have softened somewhat the sternness of their Puritan neighbors in New England. And it is at least possible that the milder character of the Pilgrims was in part due to their friendly intercourse with the Huguenots in Leyden. These "men who had the virtues of the English Puritans without their bigotry," "so far as we can learn, brought only good gifts to the American colonies," and "it seems very probable that much of American quickness and vivacity is due to the early and wide-spread diffusion of Huguenot blood."¹

Some of them made, if not more substantial, at least more tangible gifts to the homes of their adoption, from the city clock given in 1716 by Stephen Delancey to Trinity church New York, to Gabriel Manigault's loan of \$220,000 at the outset of the Revolution.² The most widely known of these gifts is, of course, the "Cradle of Liberty," donated by Peter Faneuil to the city of Boston.³

¹The quotations are from Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.*, I., 433, and from a review of Baird's work in *Atlantic Monthly*, LV., 843, ff. Eloquent tributes to their virtues may be found in the Bi-Centenary Commemoration. See especially Pres. Jay's address, p. 7, ff., and Prof. H. M. Baird's, p. 14, ff. Pp. 37 and ff. give Prof. Baird's estimate of their influence on American life.

²Holgate, *Am. Genealogy*, 115; *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, XXII., 36.

³A copy of the warrant for the town meeting to consider his offer is in *New Eng. Hist. and Gen. Reg.* XXX., 368. See also *Mem. Hist. of Boston*, I., 263, ff.

That as thrifty inhabitants they were gladly welcomed is indicated by the pecuniary aid granted to them in South Carolina, the exemption from taxes for a period of seven years in Virginia,¹ and by the general tenor of contemporary reference to them. But they were not, in most of the colonies, at once admitted to full political rights, and in some cases there was evident jealousy of them as a people of alien nationality. In Rhode Island at the outbreak of King William's war, such apprehensions of their taking part with the French were felt that they were required to appear before a magistrate and take oath "to behave themselves."² In South Carolina during Ludwell's administration, feeling ran so high that he thought it necessary for the preservation of peace to exclude the Huguenots from all legislative concerns, since "the haughty spirit (of the English) could not brook the thought of sitting in assemblies with the rivals of the English nation for power and dominion, and of receiving laws from Frenchmen, the favorers of a system of absolute government."³ It is said also that some went so far as to insist that marriages by French ministers were illegal. But in time these disturbances quieted down, a naturalization law was passed, and intermarriages took place.⁴

Special acts of naturalization and "denization" were also passed in other colonies,⁵ and we find frequent mention of Huguenots in official positions.⁶ But with one possible exception,⁷ I can find no evidence that they ever unitedly exerted

¹Va. Hist. Coll., V., 60.

²Rhode Island Col. Records, III., 264.

³Hewitt, Hist. Acc't of S. Car. and Geo. (originally published in London, 1779), in S. Car. Hist. Coll. vol. I., Hildreth, II., 210, says that in Sothel's time a law was passed for the enfranchisement of Huguenots but was one of those rejected in mass by the proprietors as lacking legal sanctions; and their increasing numbers caused the trouble in Ludwell's time.

⁴Lee, Huguenots in France and America, II., 74, 75, and 77; Hildreth, II., 213; Baneroff, II., 12.

⁵The date in Md. was 1666; in Va., 1671; Holmes, Annals, I., 344 and 357. Denization was granted in N. Y. as early as 1698, possibly earlier. Cf. N. Y. Col. Doc., IV., 450, III., 426. Denization, however, did not confer full political rights. (Huguenot Coll., I., 408), and perhaps some confusion of these laws with those for naturalization may explain the discrepancies in the date as given by different writers.

⁶Daniels, Hist. of Oxford, Mass., pp. 12 and 757; Huguenots on the Hackensack, p. 6; Mass. Hist. Coll., XXII., 30; and Mem. Hist. of N. Y., II., 49, ff. This last is a list of the Mayors of N. Y. down to 1700, several of whom were plainly of French extraction.

⁷This exception was the Leisler difficulty in N. Y. Prominent Hug-

any political influence during the whole colonial period; nor do individuals of the race seem to have played so prominent a part as in later history. Yet further, it does not appear that in any way they made definite, original contributions to political thought in those times. Whatever effect they may have had upon colonial life, politically considered, is for the most part, untraceable.

Nor need this surprise us. They had not the training in that self-government which has so characterized the Teutonic peoples. Their anomalous "state within a state" had long since ceased to have any vitality, and in its best days was rather imitative than original. They seem never to have acquired, as a people, a stock of political ideas, but probably experienced in their thinking upon such subjects—though possibly in a somewhat less degree than their fellow-countrymen—the paralyzing influence of the French system of centralization. Coming then, as they did, solely to escape persecution, and settling among a people who felt entirely competent to solve all political problems, they were not likely to be important factors in political development till they had become somewhat assimilated to the rest of the population. By the beginning of the Revolutionary period this assimilation was quite complete. And I propose to show that during that period and later individuals of French descent did much to shape the course of our national history. It must, however, be premised at the outset that the very completeness of their absorption by the people among whom they settled renders it impossible to trace fully their influence. By the translation of their names into English, by the gradual corruption of names through mispronunciation, and by intermarriages the lineage has been so obscured that many a man with a pretty large infusion of Huguenot blood may pass for a full blooded Yankee or Dutchman.¹

nenots were active in the affair and a majority of those in and around N. Y. petitioned for Leisler's pardon. They seem, too, to have acted unitedly, though without absolute unanimity. Nicholas Bayard was one of the opposition. See Huguenot Coll., I., *Introd.*, XXVIII.; *Mem. Hist. of N. Y.*, I., chap. XII. (The period of the Leisler troubles); and II., chaps. I. and II.; *Doc. of Col. Hist. of N. Y.*, IV., 972 and 1064.

¹"The French element was so speedily absorbed by the surrounding Dutch, that not a few of the numerous descendants of the Huguenot pioneers, from whom the farms they occupy have come down in unbroken descent through seven or eight generations, verily believe that they are of pure Holland stock, and the story of their French origin is to them a new revelation." Huguenots on the Hackensack, pp. 1 and 2.

II. THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD.

COMING now to the times immediately preceding the Revolution, it would be easy to compile from Force's Archives a list of men of undoubted French ancestry who belonged to committees, wrote letters, and in various other ways took part in the proceedings recorded in those fascinating volumes.¹ From other sources, too, many interesting particulars may be gleaned. At least one Huguenot² was a member of the Boston tea party, and another was one of those Americans in England who signed the petition to Parliament representing the possible fatal consequences of the Boston Port Bill.³ Nor can we forget that, when it came to actual hostilities, the country was indebted to a Huguenot for the "midnight ride" which carried the news of the British march on Lexington;⁴ nor that Francis Marion, the hero of so many gallant exploits as well as the sturdy defender of the Tories against those who desired to proscribe them,⁵ and John Laurens, whose brave conduct won him the honor of receiving the sword of Cornwallis, were Huguenots.

But time does not permit us to dwell on such details, intensely fascinating as they are, in presence of the much more

¹Besides those better known, there are such names as Legare, Bouquet, Dubois, Hasbrouck, Bonnetreau, De Saussure, etc.

²Goss' *Life of Col. Paul Revere*, I., 121. See App. to this paper for genealogical notes on Revere and other prominent Huguenots referred to.

³Henry Laurens, *Hist. Mag.*, X., 234.

⁴This was not the only ride taken by the "patriot Mercury" for his country. In 1774 he carried to N. Y. and Phil. the dispatches in regard to calling a Congress, and on several occasions took messages to Congress. He was one of the grand jury that refused to serve when Parliament made judges independent of the people. Goss, I., 153 and 159, ff.; *Mag. Am. Hist.*, XV., 5.

⁵He declared that the proposed law for the sequestration of the Tories was not in "the spirit of American liberty." See Huguenot proceedings, I., 101. Congress voted him thanks for his "wise, decided and gallant conduct in defending the liberties of his country, his prudent and intrepid attack on a party of British troops on the 31st of Aug. last, and for the distinguished part he took in the battle of the 8th of Sep." *Jour. of Cong.*, III., 683.

important deeds of a group of statesmen who profoundly influenced state and national development during the "critical" and "formative" period. Their work may perhaps best be seen by reviewing, rapidly and with special reference to the part taken by these men of French descent, some of the best known events of our history.

It need detract nothing from the honor we are accustomed to pay to those uncompromising Yankee rebels, Samuel Adams and James Otis, to recall another, a man of Huguenot ancestry, whose share in the events that precipitated the Revolution was not less important than theirs, though his name has been suffered to become less familiar to our ears. Says Winthrop: "If Otis' arguments ** breathed into this nation the breath of life, few things, if anything, ** did more to sustain that life until it was able to go alone, than the answers of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, to the insolent assumptions of Bernard and Hutchinson, mainly drafted by the same James Otis and Samuel Adams, and the answers of the Council, mainly drafted by James Bowdoin." Bowdoin was understood by the Privy Council in England to be "the leader and manager of the Council in Massachusetts, as Mr. Adams was in the House."¹ Nor is contemporary evidence to the same effect wanting. Hutchinson says: "Mr. Bowdoin was without a rival in the Council, and by the harmony and reciprocal communications between him and Mr. Adams, the measures of the Council and House harmonized also, and were made reciprocally subservient each to the other, so that when the Governor met with opposition from the one, he had reason to expect like opposition from the other."² In 1774, Hutchinson's successor, Gage, removed him, acting, as he said, under "express orders from his Majesty." When Gage called for the surrender of arms, Bowdoin was moderator of the great meeting held in Faneuil Hall to consider the demand. He was President of the Council of twenty-eight chosen in 1775 to exercise the supreme executive authority of the Province, and in the autumn of the same year was chairman of the Massachusetts delegation in the conference with Washington and the committee of Congress

¹R. C. Winthrop, Address before the Maine Hist. Soc. at Bowdoin Col., Sep. 5, 1849. As a descendant of Bowdoin, Winthrop had access to private papers, so that his address has something the character of an original document.

²Hist. of Mass. Bay III., 293, See also pp. 156, 228, and 374.

relative to the best means of conducting the campaign. Only the illness of his wife, on account of which Hancock took his place at the head of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress, prevented his being one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.¹

In New York, not only were Wm. Bayard and John Jay members of the committee of correspondence, but Jay was one of the sub-committee to prepare answers to letters received, and a letter, "probably from his pen, contains the first proposition that was made for convening a general Congress to consider the (present) state of affairs." When the Congress was convened, he was one of those unanimously chosen to represent New York. Entering upon his duties in Congress, he was placed upon the committee to prepare a memorial to the people of British America, "stating the necessity of a firm, united and invariable observation of the measures recommended by Congress," as well as on that which composed the address to the people of Great Britain.² Both these papers were probably written by Jay; the latter certainly was, and "is generally acknowledged to stand first among the incomparable productions" of the first Congress.³ Jefferson said before knowing its authorship, that it was "a production certainly worthy of the finest pen in America."⁴ The idea of the petition to the King, (July 8, 1775), originated with Jay and was carried by him against very strong opposition in Congress.⁵ The double honor of being a member of the Provincial Congress of New York and of the Continental Congress at the same time, and the necessity that was felt for his presence in the former prevented his being one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.⁶ But the New York convention's resolution of approval, (July 9, 1776), was drafted by him, the manuscript in his own handwriting being still preserved among the records of New York.⁷

¹Winthrop, 27. ff.; Bancroft, IV., 242 and VI., 139 and 140.

²Am. Archives, I., 319, ff.; Jour. of Cong., I., 19; Jay's Life of Jay, I., 24.

³Webster's Great Speeches, 311.

⁴Works, I., 10.

⁵Jay's Jay, I., 36.

⁶Jay's Jay, I., 43 and 44

⁷Correspondence and Public Papers, I., 72.

The proceedings of the secret committee of Correspondence "with the friends of America in Great Britain, Ireland and other parts of the world," were of great importance in securing the friendship of individuals abroad and probably prepared the way for the mission of Silas Deane to France. But so great was the secrecy observed that it does not seem possible to apportion the honor due to individual members of the committee. I see no reason, however, to question the opinion of his son, that Jay was "the chief organ of correspondence,"¹ especially in view of his later correspondence with Deane. On the whole, it seems quite fair to claim that there was no pen in Congress more continually and successfully used for the country at this period than Jay's.

That the New Jersey Assembly, disregarding the advice of Governor Franklin, gave "express approbation of the measures of the Congress" in 1775, is attributed by him to Elias Boudinot, afterward President of Congress, and others, who, as he says, "came down from Elizabeth Town and caballed among the members."² In South Carolina, Henry Laurens was not only a member of the First Provincial Congress, but drew up the association to be signed by all the friends of liberty, was also President of the Council, and later, as is well-known, a delegate to the Continental Congress and its President for more than a year.³

The celebrated Mecklenburg Declaration was drafted by a Huguenot, Dr. Ephraim Brevard. Though the claim of some that this paper was the original of *the* Declaration can hardly be granted, it was doubtless of much importance in fostering the spirit of Independence in North Carolina.⁴

¹Jay's Jay, I., 64.

²Letter from Gov. Franklin, dated Perth Amboy, Mar. 12, 1775, in New Jersey Archives, X., 575.

³Am. Cyc. of Biog., III., 630 and 631.

I am not ignorant of the fact that Laurens' patriotism at an early stage of the difficulties has been thought to be open to question. The letter written by him to His Majesty's Secretaries of State while in the Tower, as well as private letters written during the Stamp-Act disturbances, are of a somewhat damaging character. They may be found in Hist. Mag., X., 233., ff. See also extract from "The Royal Gazette," (N. Y., Oct. 14, 1778), on p. 316 of the same Mag. But the letter to the Secretaries was the special plea of a man who wanted to get out of prison and probably puts his conduct in the best possible light for that purpose. There are not wanting indications in his diplomatic correspondence that he never forgot himself for his country. With that limitation—unfortunately not the exclusive possession of citizens of Gallic descent—I believe his patriotism to have been sound.

⁴Randall, Life of Jefferson, III., 570, ff.; Am. Archives, II., 855

Not to go further into details, it is evident that in at least five of the colonies, the part taken by men of Huguenot descent in the events leading to the Declaration of Independence was by no means a secondary one.

When the young nation was once fairly launched upon a war for independence, these men continued the most unremitting exertions to that end,¹ but except for the brilliant mission of John Laurens to France, there is nothing of such paramount and striking importance as to demand our attention till we come to the negotiations preliminary to peace.²

It is, however, worth while to note that young Laurens not only obtained a subsidy and the assistance of Rochambeau and other officers with land and naval forces, but that he did it by the skill with which he broke through all conventionalities and secured a personal interview with the King, thereby avoiding the delays incident upon negotiations conducted through the ministry.³

and foot note; Winsor, *Nar. and Crit. Hist.*, VI., 256; Hunter, *Sketches of Western N. Car.*, 22, ff. and 47, ff.; Sabine, *Am. Loyalist*, I., 38, and articles in *Mag. of Am. Hist.*, vol. XXI.

¹I find some Huguenots in the list of Loyalists given by Sabine, but they do not seem to have been numerous.

²Such facts as that Gouverneur Morris drew up, the plan adopted by Congress for raising funds for army expenses. (*Diary and Letters*, I., 4 and 5); that he also drew up the instructions to Franklin at Versailles in 1778—the first ever sent to an American Plenipotentiary (*Spark's Life of Morris*, I., 188); that Jay drafted the circular letter to accompany the resolutions stopping the emission of bills of credit in 1779. (*Jour. of Cong.*, III., 350 and 358); that Laurens proposed and Hamilton heartily approved a scheme for raising two or three battalions of Negro troops. (*Jay's Works*, I., 191, ff. and Bancroft, V., 369 and 370); that Washington obtained through Bowdoin's "confidential agency" * * * a plan of the harbor of Halifax with a view to its destruction by the French fleet." in 1780. (*Winthrop*, p. 29); that on the invasion of S. Car. in 1779, Manigault, though over 75 years of age, shouldered a musket and offered himself and his fourteen-year-old grand-son to the service of his country. (*Commemoration of Bi-Centennary*, p. 54); though very interesting, can hardly be said to have had a determining effect on the course of U. S. History. It was possibly more important that some of the best Revolutionary officers were Huguenots. (*Proceedings of Huguenot Soc.*, I., 41, and Cf. *Register of Officers*).

³*Army Correspondence of John Laurens*, p. 31, ff. Congress passed the following resolution: "That the conduct of John Laurens in his mission to the court of Versailles as special minister of the U. S., is highly agreeable to Cong. and entitles him to public approbation," *Jour. of Cong.*, III., 663.

III. THE TREATY OF PEACE.

THE COMMITTEE that negotiated peace with Great Britain consisted as finally constituted, of John Jay, Henry Laurens, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams. It is, of course, a matter of interest to know just how far we are indebted to each of them for the important provisions of the treaty. If we accept the views of all who have written on the subject, we shall be compelled to believe among other things that it was essentially the work of Franklin,¹ that we are indebted for the concessions in regard to the fisheries to Adams,² that the glory belongs to Jay and Adams but especially to Jay,³ that it was owing to Laurens that the frontiers of the Republic were extended to the Mississippi river,⁴ and in this way the later annexation of Louisiana provided for,⁴ and that on this very point "we have greater reason for gratitude to John Jay than to either of his colleagues."⁵ The truth probably is as stated by Fiske: "To the grand triumph the varied talents of Franklin, Adams and Jay all contributed."⁶

Yet I venture to hold the opinion that the services of Mr. Jay were even more important than those of either of his colleagues, valuable as those doubtless were. The subject cannot, as it seems to me, be fully understood without reading the remarkable series of letters written while he was Minister Plenipotentiary to Spain, as well as the correspondence after his transfer to Versailles.⁷ It must be borne in mind that the "family compact" between France and Spain rendered it of the first importance to avoid giving offence to Spain, not only for the sake

¹Parton, *Life of Franklin*, II, 650. "He saved the alliance over and over again and brought the negotiations to a successful close."

²*Life by C. F. Adams*, 380, ff.

³Roosevelt, *Life of Morris*, 124.

⁴Weiss, *Hist. of French Protestant Refugees*, I., 366.

⁵Hinsdale, *Old Northwest*, 182.

⁶*Critical Period of Am. Hist.*, 35.

⁷The letters are in Sparks' *Diplomatic Correspondence*, VII. and VIII., and the more important ones in Jay's *Works*, I. and II.

of an alliance with her, but for the continuance of friendly relations with France. And the fair inference from the way in which the Ministers were treated is that neither France nor Spain was anxious to secure great advantages for the young Republic, and that the latter at least was most unwilling that its borders should be extended to the Mississippi. That her intention to prevent this result was only prevented by Jay's firmness and foresight is the conclusion to which one is irresistibly drawn on reading the correspondence. Nor is there more reason to doubt that his courage in accepting the bills which Congress, depending on the financial assistance of Spain, had drawn upon him, and his skill in securing the means to redeem them, probably saved the country from immediate bankruptcy, which would have been fatal to all hopes of independence.

What was thought of his statesmanship at the time may be seen from the letter of Samuel Huntington, President of Congress, written under the direction of that body, in which he says, "throughout the whole course of your negotiations and transactions, in which the utmost address and discernment was often necessary to reconcile the respect due to the dignity of the United States with the urgency of their wants and the complaisance expected by the Spanish Court, your conduct is entirely approved."¹ And later, Robert R. Livingstone wrote, "your conduct through the whole of your negotiations has been particularly acceptable to Congress."²

After he joined Franklin in France his zeal and sagacity in securing the ends sought were no less apparent. It is not necessary to decide whether Vergennes was more friendly than he thought, nor whether Vaughan's mission to England was *the* bit of diplomacy that secured the recognition of United States Independence as a preliminary to entering upon the treaty. In any case there can be no question that he showed great adroitness in his plan for outwitting what *seemed* to him a wily maneuver. And in breaking loose from the instructions to follow the advice of the French Court, it was Jay who took the lead and almost compelled Franklin to follow. He says in his report that Franklin was "fettered" by

¹Jay's Works, II., 32, dated, "In Cong., May 28, 1781."

²Jay's Work, II., 188. The letter, Apr. 16, 1782, is in answer to Jay's of Oct. 3, 1781.

them, but that he "could not believe that Congress intended that we (they) should follow any advice that might be repugnant to their interest."¹

From all the evidence, then, I feel compelled to infer that Jay's influence in keeping the country from utter bankruptcy till peace could be secured, in obtaining the Mississippi boundary, in making the recognition of independence one of the prior conditions of the treaty and in breaking away from French dictation as to the terms, was second to that of neither of his colleagues. The "Yankee shrewdness" which Fiske thinks was more than a match for the "traditional French subtlety"² was itself of Gallic origin.

As to the Fisheries question, his share of the merit is not so clear, though Hamilton says that the people of New England talked of offering him an annual tribute of fish.³ He seems, however, at the very least, to have seconded Adams very ably in that matter. Speaking in general terms of the whole treaty, Adams said that the principal merit was Jay's.⁴ And Fitzherbert, in 1853, said that it was "not only chief but solely through Jay's means that the negotiations between England and the United States were brought to a successful conclusion."⁵ These statements from other chief actors in the affair do not seem to me too strong.

Laurens' part in the negotiations seems comparatively unimportant. Nor do his letters have the same ring of statesman-like and unselfish patriotism as Jay's.⁶ But in his own opinion, after being admitted to bail in London, he made many converts to the idea of American Independence "among people of the first importance."⁷ And Bancroft credits him with having proposed the clause forbidding the British to carry away Negroes or other property.⁸ However, the work of Jay alone during these trying negotiations would compel the admission that our national independence with the favorable

¹Works, II., 384.

²Critical Period of Am. Hist., 24.

³Hamilton, Works, VIII., 148.

⁴Letter to Jay in 1880, Jay's Jay, I., 418.

⁵Windsor, Narrative and Critical Hist., VII., 169; Flanders, Lives and Times of the Chief Justices, I., 343 and 351 and foot note.

⁶They are in Sparks' Dip. Cor., vol. II.

⁷Dip Cor., II., 466 and 469, ff., Cf. also 482.

⁸History, V., 579.

conditions secured was not altogether an Anglo-Saxon achievement.

Our interest in American history from the stamp-act to the treaty of Paris is apt to center about the stirring events of the Revolution. But during those years the foundations of trans-Alleghany commonwealths were being laid with a heroism worthy of the times. Among the backwoodsmen who first peopled that region were quite a number of Huguenots, and one of them, John Sevier,¹ was a principal actor in some of the most important events connected with state-building there. So that not only in the thirteen original colonies, but in some of the earliest off-shoots from them, we may trace the influence of exiles from France.

¹Sevier's work has been well told by Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, and in Phelan's *Hist. of Tenn.*

IV. STATE CONSTITUTIONS.

WHILE the war was still in progress, most of the states formed new constitutions under which they lived for many years. Bowdoin was President of the Massachusetts Convention in 1779 and with the Adamses prepared, during a recess of the convention, a draft which with some modifications was adopted. Judge Lowell "who was himself second to no one in that convention for the zeal and ability, which he brought to the work," says of Bowdoin that "it was owing to the hints which he occasionally gave and the part which he took with the committee who framed the plan that some of the most admired sections in the Constitution of this state appear in their present form."¹ To have been one of the chief framers of the Constitution under which—with an occasional amendment—the old Bay State has lived and prospered for more than a century, is surely no slight honor; but that is not all. "The ordinance of 1787 is a condensed abstract of the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780. Every principle contained in the former either in a germinal or a developed form, except that relating to the obligation of contracts, and some temporary provisions relating to the organization of the territorial government is found in the latter, and often in the same language."² And since the development of the country west of the Alleghanies owes so much to this ordinance, and since, further, the Constitution of Massachusetts and hence the Ordinance owes so much to a descendant of the Huguenots, it may as well be granted at once that some of the most boasted characteristics of our national career are due neither to the Anglo-Saxon nor to the Dutchman.

After the new constitution went into effect, Bowdoin was appointed with the Justices of the Supreme Court, the Attorney-General, and John Pickering "to revise the laws in force in

¹Winthrop, 30 and 31; Hildreth, III., 375.

²Dr. Cutler and the Ordinance of 1787, by W. F. Poole, N. Am. Review, CXXII., 229, ff. The quotation is on page 258. A comparison of the Ordinance (Poore, I., 429—432) with the Cons. of Mass. (Poore, I., 956-973) will abundantly repay any student.

the state, to select, abridge, alter, and digest them so as to be accommodated to the present government." Winthrop says: "I have seen ample evidence in his papers of the labor which he bestowed on the duties of this distinguished and most responsible commission."¹

In the New York Convention of 1776, Jay and Gouverneur Morris were leading members. Jay is said to have prepared the draft of the Constitution and his eulogists are probably right in attributing its most important features to him, though it is difficult to find direct and positive evidence of the fact. He made strenuous exertions to obtain a clause excepting Roman Catholics from toleration till they should abjure the authority of the Pope to grant absolution. The most that could be obtained, however, was a proviso—said to have been proposed by Morris—and which was retained in subsequent revisions of the Constitution, that "the liberty of conscience hereby granted shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the safety of the state," and an amendment to the naturalization clause requiring all persons to "abjure allegiance to all and every foreign king, prince, potentate, and state, in all matters ecclesiastical as well as civil," before becoming naturalized citizens. It was also due to him that acts of attainder were not allowed to work corruption of the blood. It seems quite likely that his urgency on this point was due to his knowledge of the wrong endured by his ancestors and the ingrained hatred of all that caused those wrongs. The restriction of suffrage, in some cases, to freeholders was in accordance with his favorite maxim that "those who owned the country ought to govern it."²

¹Address, p. 32.

²On the points covered by this paragraph. Cf. Jay's *Jay*, I., 70; Roosevelt's *Morris*, 66; and *Pellew's Jay*, 85-87.

V. THE NATIONAL CONSTITUTION.

THE WAR being closed and independence secured, it might be hoped that the young Republic, entering upon its course under such favorable circumstances, endowed with such a wealth of natural resources, and above all rich in men of such conspicuous ability, would move forward in a path of uninterrupted prosperity. But there were only too evident signs of danger from within which threatened its very existence. The Confederacy proved to be a rope of sand, and there was no power to cope successfully with the pressing financial and other problems. Men of judgment and patriotism were by no means agreed as to the wisest measures to be taken. It is a curious and, as I think, a very significant fact that, when the Anglo-Saxon spirit of localization was endangering the life of the Republic, men of French extraction who were prominent in public life expressed with wonderful unanimity¹ a belief that a stronger central government was imperatively demanded. A few citations will establish this point, but I do not propose to discuss, still less to answer, the probably unanswerable question, *how far* their views were due to inherited and innate tendencies of the Gallic mind. As early as 1779, Elias Boudinot said in a private letter: "I am not afraid of the dissolution of the Confederacy in my day, but I dread the consequences on the present basis to posterity. In my weak opinion, Congress has not power enough."² In 1783, Jay wrote: "I am perfectly convinced that no time is to be lost in raising and maintaining a national spirit in America. *Power to govern this confederacy as to all general purposes should be granted and exercised.* The governments of the different states should be wound up and become vigorous."³ He also urged repeatedly that the construction of

¹One exception ought to be noted. Tyler in the Va. debates on the Constitution dreaded too great centralization as dangerous to liberty. Elliot's Debates, III., 637, ff.

²Hist. Mag., 2nd series, III., 80.

³Works, (Correspondence and Public Papers), III., 85. See also 143, 172 and 178 for other letters in which he expresses similar views.

the government was "fundamentally wrong" in not separating legislative, judicial, and executive functions; his idea being, if I understand him, that a distribution of powers would make the government more energetic and effective.¹ His desire for a more highly centralized government is the more noteworthy from the fact that he had, as he says, "from early life expressed a strong dislike to the arbitrary government of France," and thought it a government "always dreadful in theory and more or less so in practice according to the character of those by whom its power is exercised."²

Gouverneur Morris wrote to General Greene: "From the same attachment to the happiness of mankind which prompted my first efforts in this Revolution, I am now induced to wish that Congress may be possessed of much more authority than has hitherto been granted to them."³ His views may be still more clearly read in the Journals of the Convention, where, as Lodge says, "he favored a vigorous central government, opposed bitterly equality of votes in the Senate, and sought to weaken the powers of the states."⁴

Lodge says that "from Massachusetts under the lead of Bowdoin came the first effort for a better union in the form of instructions to her representatives to urge the necessity for a new convention upon Congress."⁵ The first expression of such necessity doubtless came from some other source, though Winthrop says that Pelatiah Webster, one of those who are credited with it, was a friend of Bowdoin's.⁶ But, however much or little credit we may give the latter in initiating the proceedings, the fact of his strong recommendation to the legislature establishes the point I am urging, namely, that he favored greater power in the central government. And if, as

¹Works, III., 210, 226, 234. He repeats the same views, after the adoption of the Constitution, in his charge to the Grand Jury on his Eastern Circuit. Works, III., 387.

²Works, IV., 199.

³Diary and Letters, I., 15. This was in 1781.

⁴Atlantic Monthly, LVII., 436. For his remarks in convention see Scott's edition of Madison's Jour., 57, note, 285, 310, 361, etc.

⁵Life of Hamilton, 53.

⁶Address, 43. Burgess says, (Political Science and Constitutional Law, I., 101 and 102), that Bowdoin and Hamilton were more far-seeing than the rest of the statesmen of the day and "discovered the root of the difficulty, viz.: that the sovereign, the state, had no legal organization in the system."

Hart thinks, the success of Shay's rebellion would have made the union "not worth one of its own discredited notes,"¹ he has a still greater claim upon our gratitude.

But unquestionably the most thorough centralizer of them all was "America's greatest political genius," Alexander Hamilton. Before, during, and after the Convention, he expressed in the most explicit terms his belief in the necessity of a strong central government and of the danger to be apprehended from giving too much power to the states. In his letter to Duane in 1780,² in his series of papers, the *Continentalist*,³ in the resolutions he introduced in Congress in 1783,⁴ in the debates of the Convention,⁵ in the *Federalist*,⁶ in his speech on the revenue system in the New York Legislature in 1787,⁷ in fact everywhere throughout his works, we may read his dread of state sovereignty and of power entrusted to the people.

Two only of these men were members of the Convention, Morris and Hamilton. As to the former, it may be said that the impression made by an examination of the debates is that he influenced the course of proceedings, perhaps as much as anyone. To this may be added the opinion of Madison, that he was an "able, active and eloquent member."⁸ To him also we owe, as regards the language of the Constitution, "that admirable perspicacity which has so much diminished the labors and hazards of interpretation for all future ages."⁹

A first hasty reading of the debates is likely to prove disappointing to anyone brought up on the tradition that to Hamilton, more than to anyone else, we owe the frame of government under which we live.¹⁰ But further study is reassuring. If

¹Formation of the Union, 113.

²Works 1203, ff. Garfield says of him, "in camp before he was twenty-one years old, upon a drum-head, he wrote a letter which contained every germ of the Constitution of the United States." (In speech to the "Boys in Blue" N. Y., Aug. 6, 1880, quoted by Hinsdale in preface to Garfield's Works, p. XIX). I think he must refer to the Duane letter, but Hamilton was twenty-three at that time.

³Works, 231, ff.

⁴Works, I., 288, ff.

⁵Elliot, I. 417, ff., and Madison Papers, II., 244, and elsewhere.

⁶No. XVII., for example.

⁷Works, II., 16, ff.

⁸Letter to Sparks, Elliot, I., 507.

⁹Curtis Hist. of the Cons., I., 297. Cf. Madison's letter quoted above, and Morris' letter to Pickering, I. 506 and 507.

the eleven propositions which he submitted to the Convention¹ do not seem to be of superlative importance, the speech by which he supported them was one that, as is evident from the draft what remains to us² must have carried great weight, especially when coming from a man of so vigorous a personality. And the full plan of a constitution that he gave to Madison³ presents with, it is true, many points of divergence, points of coincidence with that finally adopted, so many and so striking, as to force the conviction that it must have been known to the Committees who drafted the different articles and must have modified the result to a large extent. We must remember, too, that by this time his views had probably become well known to most men in public life and could not have failed to influence some of them. There is a tradition that he did much in private conversation, during the time the Convention was in session, to "filtrate" his ideas through the material of the Constitution.⁴

The splendid services of Jay and Hamilton in securing the adoption of the Constitution have never been questioned. The numbers of the *Federalist* written by them are enduring monuments of their work.⁵ In the Massachusetts Convention that ratified the Constitution, both James Bowdoin and his son made speeches in its favor.⁶

To sum up the fragmentary details, I am thoroughly convinced that, for the advocacy of "a more perfect union," for efforts to obtain a convention with that end in view, for able and influential services during its sessions, and for vigorous and successful efforts to secure the ratification of the Constitution, we are more indebted to four men of Huguenot ancestry, James Bowdoin, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, and John Jay, than to any other four statesmen of the time.⁷

¹Elliot, I., 179, or Madison Papers, 185, ff.

²Works, I., 353, ff.

³Works, I., 334, ff. It may also be found in Supplement to Elliot, App., 585, ff.

⁴Morse Life of Hamilton, I., 184.

⁵See also, Jay's Address to the people of N. Y., Works, III., 294. Cf. Jay's Jay, I., 260-262 and 269; Elliot, II., 283, ff.

For Hamilton's work in N. Y. Convention, Elliot, II., 231-369.

⁶Elliot, II., 81; 125, and 178.

Revere had something to do with securing Samuel Adams', at first doubtful, support. Goss, II., 451., ff.

⁷To Morris also we owe the suggestion for our decimal system of coinage, though his plan received important modifications from Jefferson before it was adopted.

VI. THE EARLY DAYS OF THE CONSTITUTION.

BUT no plan of government, even if it be "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man," will execute itself. And "the more perfect union," which owed so much to Gallic brains in its inception, might have been as disastrous a failure as the old Confederacy, had not those same brains devised the measures for its workings in its early years. To tell adequately the part taken by these men, especially by Jay and Hamilton, during the first decade of the constitutional period would be to rewrite the history of that decade. For present purposes, it will suffice to assume the facts known to every reader of our national history, in order to trace their effect in the evolution of that history.

We are apt to think of Hamilton as the man who "smote the rock of the national resources and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth." The idea, which I believe to be altogether correct, that all his work tended toward centralization, though advanced by some writers, is not so prominent in the popular thought as it deserves to be. That it was, in fact, a deliberate purpose with him, to effect that end can hardly be doubted by any one who makes a study of all his writings. His dread of giving too much power to individual states, his desire to make the central government strong and controlling must impress the most casual reader. That, to some extent, "he builded wiser than he knew" is very probable.¹

His schemes for assumption and funding—too well known to need explanation here—though strenuously opposed at the time, are now generally admitted to have been, from a financial standpoint, eminently wise. Indeed it would seem that there was no escape from repudiation except through some system

¹Jefferson says, (Works III., 461), that the object of Hamilton's plan was to subvert the principles of the Constitution, and that this was to be done by corrupting the Legislature. Something must be allowed for the political animosity of the two men, but it is doubtless true that he desired to make more prominent those principles of the Constitution which Jefferson wished to make less prominent.

of funding, and no other workable plan was suggested by any one.¹ His first report on Public Credit will probably always remain a financial classic. Had he done no more than to rescue the country from impending financial ruin, and to lay the foundation for business prosperity, he would deserve our lasting gratitude. But the assumption of state debts by the general government was, if not the first step, certainly the first prominent and important step, in that process of centralization which is, perhaps, not yet completed. That this result was not absent from his thought, (though he could hardly have had a full conception of the far-reaching consequences of his plan), is evident from the fact that he distinctly proposes as one of "the great and invaluable ends to be secured by a proper and adequate provision, at the present period, for the support of public credit," this, "to cement more closely the union of the states."²

His next important measure, the National Bank, still further assisted the process of centralization, and that in two ways. First, by the direct strength it brought the government, a strength which can only be realized in connection with later contests over a national banking system, and second, (and this is much more important), through the doctrine of "implied powers" then, apparently for the first time broached and made operative.³ Undoubtedly it did much to widen the breach between Federalist and Anti-Federalist. But, far more than that, it was the entering wedge of the principle that the "ins" of whatever party have ever since found it convenient to use, and that the "outs" have as often opposed. It is a principle, too, whatever we may think of its constitutionality, upon which many of the most beneficial measures of the government must rest for their defense. Nor did his opponents or the friends of his measure fail to understand their probable effects. On the one hand, it was claimed that the doctrine of implied

¹Works, II., 47. ff.; Am. State Papers Finance, I., 15, ff.

²Works, I., 52. His dread of a dissolution of the union, unless proper revenue measures were adopted, comes out in his speech on the Revenue System in the N. Y. Leg., 1787. Works, II., 16, ff.—see especially p. 43; all his important reports may be found in Am. State Papers on Finance, I.

³Hamilton's report is in his Works, III., 125, ff., and his reply to Jefferson's and Randolph's constitutional objections, 180, ff. The latter is far more important for the student of constitutional questions, being the first and one of the ablest expositions of the fundamental doctrine that has been so large a factor in political controversy ever since.

powers "establishes a precedent of interpretation leveling all the barriers which limit the powers of the general government and protect those of the state Government;"¹ "that the admission of this doctrine destroys the principle of our government at a blow, it at once breaks down every barrier which the Federal Constitution has raised against unlimited legislation;"² and that some of the arguments involved "a very dangerous construction of the powers vested in the General Government."³

On the other hand it was argued that it was impossible to carry any provision into execution "without this reasonable latitude of construction," and that powers had already been exercised by Congress which had been "deduced * * by necessary implication;"⁴ but at the same time it was admitted that "the advocates of this measure * * being those who in general advocate national measures * * are charge with designs to extend the powers of the government unduly."⁵

The report on Manufactures, though it had no immediate effect on legislation, has nevertheless been the armory from which the chief weapons for the defense of the protective system have been drawn; and it is perhaps not too much to suppose that its effect, though not so easily traceable, has been quite as great as that of his other papers. Certainly in so far as its principles have been adopted, they have tended to the growth of the national power which he so earnestly advocated.⁶

Not only did he mark out in these three papers a national policy of finance that has moulded much subsequent history, but even in some of the details of administration, his system has been followed by every Secretary since his time.⁷

It was through these financial measures that his most im-

¹Madison, Benton's Abridgement, I., 278. The whole speech, 274, ff., is worthy of study.

²Stone of Md.: Benton, I., 293.

³Jackson of Ga.: Benton, I., 286.

⁴Boudinot; Benton, I., Ames expressed similar views, 278, ff.

⁵Lawrence of N. Y.: Benton, I., 284.

⁶The report which was made to the House, Dec. 5, 1791, is in his Works III., 294, ff. As early as the time—1774—when he wrote his "Full Vindication," Works, I., 3, ff., he thought we might live without foreign trade and that manufactures, once established, "would pave the way still more to the future grandeur and glory of America, and by lessening its need of external commerce render it still securer against the encroachments of tyranny." Works, I., 18.

⁷Bolles, Financial Hist. of the U. S., (1789—1860.) p. 17.

portant work was done. Yet his influence as a Federal leader and his statesmanlike foresight, shown in his views on many public questions,¹ must not be forgotten. Perhaps there is no better summing up of the conclusion to which one must be led by the study of his letters and papers in connection with the history of the times, than that of Prof. W. G. Sumner; "the contest with anarchy and repudiation was the great work which went to the making of this nation at the close of the last century, and Alexander Hamilton was one of the leading heroes of it."²

It must be admitted, however, that Hamilton's influence upon political life was not altogether beneficent. We may, in deed, dismiss as unfounded the charge of his enemies that he wished for the destruction of the Republic and the establishment of monarchy.³ The trade of votes between different sections of the country by which he secured his financial measures⁴ may possibly have been a justifiable compromise. And his conduct in the Presidential elections of 1796 and 1800 is perhaps for the most part defensible, though it is the upparty manager rather than the statesman that appears in it. But his proposal to Jay, then Governor of New York, to secure the re-election of Adams by a sharp maneuver with the legislature is utterly indefensible and his reasoning is precisely that of the time-serving politician, although he disclaims all desire to have anything done "which integrity will forbid."⁵ Consider-

¹The scope of this paper forbids a detailed study of these points, the more so as able writers have already given attention to the subject. Some papers of his especially worthy of note in this connection are the letter to Harrison Gray Otis concerning the acquisition of Florida and Louisiana, written in 1779, (Works, VIII., 523 and 524); his remarks on aiming at an ascendancy in American affairs, (Federalist, No. XI.), which seems almost to entitle him to the credit of being the inventor of the Monroe Doctrine; and the Camillus papers in defense of Jay's treaty, (Works, IV., 371, ff., and V., 1-332.)

²Life of Hamilton, 13.

³King said that he disapproved of the scheme for a Northern Confederacy. See New England Federalism, 148. And in his Report on Manufactures there is a very interesting passage in which he deprecates the idea of a "contrariety of interests between the North and South." In the much talked of Miranda affair, it was the participation of the government for which he wished. See letters to Rufus King and to Miranda, Aug. 22, 1798, Works, VIII., 505-507.

⁴"The Potomac Trade." See Jefferson's Works, IX., 92, ff.

⁵The electors in N. Y. at that time were chosen by the Legislature. A plan to have them chosen by districts had been defeated by the Federalists at the previous session, on the ground that it was unconstitutional (Hammond, Political Hist. of N. Y., I., 133). When it appeared from the

ing such a deed in connection with the weight that his ability and unquestioned services to the country have given to all his acts there is reason to feel that he was to some extent responsible for debauching the public conscience and that his example has encouraged later and lesser politicians to go still farther in the ways of doubtful political morality.¹

Jay's public services after the adoption of the Constitution were performed in the capacity of Chief Justice of the United States, from 1789 to 1795, of special envoy to Great Britain in 1794 and 1795, and of Governor of New York from 1795 to 1801. His brief tenure of office as Chief Justice was made practically briefer yet by his mission to England. Beside that, the nation was still too young to furnish many of the complicated problems of our later jurisprudence. Nevertheless he left his mark on our judicial history. It is well known that the decision that a state was suable by the citizens of another state led to the eleventh amendment of the Constitution. What is not so generally known, but is much more important, is, that by this first notable decision of the Supreme Court the subordination of the State to the Nation was established as a constitutional principle. Jay's discussion of sovereignty, his historical exposition of the way in which the people of the United States established a Constitution "by which it was their will that the state government should be bound, and to which the state constitutions should be made to conform," and his conclusion that the "sovereignty of the nation is on the people of the nation," and only the "residuary sovereignty" in the people of the state ought not to be overlooked in any study of the development of the spirit of nationality.² Had the decision been different, had the doctrine of States Rights been recognized at the outset by the Supreme judicial authority, it is at

results of the spring elections that the new Legislature would support Jefferson, Hamilton proposed to Jay to call the old Legislature together at once and secure the appointment of electors by districts, which it was thought would give the election to Adams. Hamilton's Works, VIII., 549, ff. Jay's endorsement upon the letter, "proposing a measure for party purposes which I think it would not become me to adopt." (Jay's Jay, I., 414), well illustrates the moral difference between the two men.

¹Jefferson said he was "so bewitched and perverted by British example as to be under thorough conviction that corruption was essential to the government of a nation." (Works, IX., 97). He also plainly implies that the Bank was intended to control the action of Congress, p. 95.

²The opinion may be found in his Works, III., 453, ff., and 2 Dallas, 419, ff.

least supposable that the conflicts of succeeding years would have led to an early disruption of the Union.

No other question of paramount constitutional importance seems to have come before him for decision.¹ Scarcely less important, however, is the fact that as "Chief Justice of his own state and of the United States, he impressed Grand Jurors and all concerned with the necessity of encouraging a profound respect for law and constitution in the new order of things, and at the outset, through his own personal dignity and integrity gave character to our highest courts since traditionally preserved."²

Jay's treaty with England excited violent opposition at the time so little seemed to be gained in comparison with what was granted. Opinions regarding it will always differ, probably, since the question is largely whether war, especially in view of the probably resulting alliance with revolutionary France would have been a national calamity. But in view of his long, tedious, and so eminently successful negotiations in the Revolutionary period, it will not do to assert, as does one historian, that "he had always been a timid negotiator on America's behalf."³ Neither does his correspondence in connection with the treaty justify such a statement.⁴ His own opinion that no more favorable conditions were at that time attainable,⁵ is also entitled to some weight. It should not be forgotten, either, that in the course of negotiations with England for twenty-five years subsequently this nation scored no very marked success.⁶ It was necessary to demonstrate our claim to be a great

¹His charge to the Grand Jury at Richmond, (Works, III., 478, ff.), is considered by Pellet to have placed our international relations on a legal basis. It may be questioned, however, whether that was really done till actual questions came up for adjudication. H. L. Carson says, (Supreme Court of the U. S., 160, ff.), that the first important cause (Geo. V. Brailsford and others, 2 Dallas, 40, ff., and 415, ff.), involved the theory that the treaty of peace was part of the supreme law and could not be restricted in its operation by state action or state laws.

²Johnston, Preface to Jay's Works.

³Schouler, I., 293.

⁴Am. State Papers, Foreign Relations, I., 470—525. The more important letters are also in Works, Vol. IV.

⁵Works, IV., 138.

⁶"It is a little remarkable that no subsequent arrangement with Great Britain has been equally advantageous." Dwight, Hist. of Hartford Convention, 51.

"Jay's treaty was a masterpiece of diplomacy, considering the time and circumstances of the country." Sumner, Life of Jackson, 12.

See also Jay's Jay, I., 378, for the commercial privileges and the

nation before that claim was accepted. That Jay's Treaty secured a period of comparative quiet, in which the national life had time to mature, is its chief, and probably a sufficient defense.

The most important—from a national point of view—of Jay's acts while Governor of New York has already been noticed. In general it may be said, that his political conduct was dictated by a high sense of honor and a lofty patriotism. He always refused to use his influence with the President or the heads of Departments in securing appointments to office.¹ When in 1792, by methods since quite familiar to the citizens of New York, the office of Governor to which he had undoubtedly been chosen was given to his opponent, the popular indignation was so great that a word from him would probably have led to methods for redressing the wrong as illegal as those which procured it.² That in a state and nation just learning the difficult lesson of self-government, such a course would have fostered a disposition to exercise a sort of political lynch law can hardly be doubted. So that his holding his followers to a reverence for law, was not the least of his services to his country. Again, in his refusal on moral grounds to support one of the candidates of his party and in his published vindication of his course, he pointed out, with a clearness that has not been improved, the somewhat difficult line between party fealty and personal independence.³

The reader of *Morris'* diary and letters is at once impressed by the fact that he was of all our Revolutionary Huguenot statesmen the most thorough man of the world, and in so far the most typical Frenchman. Possibly it was owing to this characteristic that he was able to overcome some of the difficulties incident to the position of Minister at the Court of Versailles during the trying period of the French Revolution.

large indemnities received by Am. merchants under the treaty. It is of interest to note that the claims were prosecuted in the English Admiralty Courts by another Huguenot, Samuel Bayard. (Proceedings of Huguenot Soc., II., 144.)

¹Jay's Jay., I. 281.

²For an account of the fraud, see Jay's Jay, I., 284, ff.

³He says "we are and will be faithful to the * * party, but we will also be faithful to our sense and conviction of what is decent and becoming for us to do. Adherence to party has its limits, and they are prescribed and marked by that supreme wisdom which has united and associated true policy with rectitude and honor and self-respect." This was in 1812. Jay's Jay, I., 449.

He was probably the only ambassador who was able to remain during the Reign of Terror.¹ His principal work was the management of our debt to France and the protesting against outrages upon our commerce. To have obtained just satisfaction at that juncture would doubtless have been out of the question for any one. *Not* to "sacrifice personal or national dignity"² was clearly a work of some importance and one for which there were few Americans of the time so well fitted.

After his return to this country he served an unexpired term of three years in the Senate but without any noteworthy connection with measures of far-reaching importance. His sympathies were strongly Federalist and at one time he evidently desired a union of the northern states against administration measures.³

Boudinot remained in Congress for two terms after the adoption of the Constitution and the meager details given in the Annals of Congress show him to have taken an active part in the questions that came up for consideration. We have already seen that he favored Hamilton's financial measures. On another great Constitutional question—that of removal from office—he argued in favor of giving that power to the President alone, and thought the efficiency of the government might depend on the determination of the question.⁴

Bowdoin recommended to the Legislature of Massachusetts, as early as 1786, measures for the protection of manufactures, mentioning iron and wool as of especial importance, and under his lead the Legislature passed a bill to counteract the restrictive policy of foreign nations. The operation of the bill was to cease whenever Congress should receive power to take the

¹Diary and Letters, I., 576. Lodge asserts it as a fact. Atl. Monthly, LVII., 444.

²See entry in his Diary, II., 70, Oct. 12, 1794, the day of his leaving Paris. He says he "would have gained everything," if the Am. government had refused to recall him. His recall was not due to any dissatisfaction on Washington's part with him or his conduct of affairs. See Writings of Washington, XII., 433, ff. Lodge in the article cited above makes a much stronger presentation of the case for Morris than I have done. While not questioning his opinion, I have found no evidence by which I can reach his conclusion independently.

³Diary and Letters, II., 542, 545, 546, 547, 551, ff., will give an idea of his political views.

His biographers and eulogists represent him to have been the original proposer of the Erie Canal. (Sparks, I., 495, ff.; Roosevelt, 359; and Lodge in the article already cited.) Evidence against his claim may be found in Vol. II., of the Publications of the Buffalo Hist. Soc.

⁴Elliot, IV., 357, ff., and 389, ff.

matter under national control. For this early recommendation, Winthrop thinks he should be considered the grandfather of the American system, whoever may rightfully claim to be its father.¹

The views of the Huguenots on the question of slavery should not be passed without notice. Anthony Benezet, who devoted his life to the cause of religion and humanity—largely in connection with this question—was a Huguenot. His work was chiefly done before the Revolution, but he is said to have had a personal conference with every member of the Pennsylvania Legislature that passed the act of gradual abolition in 1780.² Manigault refused to traffic in slaves and treated his own with kindness.³ Henry Laurens wrote to his son in 1776, expressing in unmistakable terms his abhorrence of slavery and his determination to free his own slaves as fast as possible.⁴ Freneau also wrote against slavery.⁵

In the Constitutional Convention, arguing for representation according to the number of *free* inhabitants, Morris declared he would never "concur in upholding domestic slavery," characterized it as a nefarious institution and "the curse of Heaven" on the states where it prevailed.⁶ Hamilton had previously moved a resolution for representation on that basis,⁷ but he was absent from the convention for several weeks including the day, August 8,⁸ on which the discussion took place, and this accounts for his taking no part in it. His sentiments may be easily inferred from the fact that the Manumission Society made him one of their counsel in 1798.⁹ He was also one of the petitioners who declared to the New York Legislature in 1786 that the men held as slaves by the laws of New York were free by the laws of God.¹⁰ Boudinot's strong anti-slavery views

¹Address, 44. ff.

²Wilson, *Rise and Fall of the Slave Power*, I., 10.

³Lee, II., 77.

⁴An extract from the letter is given by Greeley, *Am. Conflict*, I., 36, footnote.

⁵*Proceedings of Huguenot Soc.*, II., 71.

⁶Madison's Journal, 478.

⁷Madison's Journal, 76.

⁸Sumner, *Life of Hamilton*, 134, says he was absent June 29-Aug. 13.

⁹*Works*, (J. C. Hamilton's ed.), VI., 268.

¹⁰Goodell, *Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, 97. He refers to MSS. of Wm. Jay.

come out clearly in the Congressional debates on the slave trade.¹

But it is John Jay of whose opinions on this subject we have the fullest record. In the New York Constitutional Convention, Morris introduced a recommendation to future Legislatures to take measures for the abolition of domestic slavery, but it was not adopted. Jay, who was absent at the time and seems not to have known of the proposition, wrote to Livingston and Morris that he should have been "for a clause against the continuance of domestic slavery."² Writing from St. Ildefonso in 1780 of the plan for gradual abolition, he said: "Till America comes into this measure, her prayers to Heaven for liberty are impious. This is a strong expression, but it is just. Were I in your Legislature I would prepare a bill for this purpose with great care, and I would never cease moving it till it became a law or I ceased to be a member. I believe God governs the world and I believe it to be a maxim in His as in our courts, that those who ask for equity ought to do it."³ Notwithstanding these strong expressions he made no recommendations for such a measure in his first message after he became Governor of New York. In the opinion of his son, he refrained from doing so from a belief that, in the state of politics, such a proposition from him would arouse party antagonism.⁴ At any rate, early in the session an intimate friend of his introduced a bill for gradual emancipation. It was defeated, as were two subsequent attempts, but in 1790 such a bill actually passed. "Probably," says his son, "no measure of his administration afforded him such unfeigned pleasure." He was the first President of the Manumission Society and himself purchased slaves for the purpose of freeing them.⁵

From the above survey, it is quite evident that for the curse of slavery left as a legacy by the Revolutionary fathers we are *not* indebted to statesmen of Huguenot descent.

It thus appears that for invaluable services during the con-

¹Especially *Annals*, II., 1466, ff.

²*Works*, I., 136, and footnote. Also *Morris, Diary and Letters*, I., 7.

³*Works*, I., 407. The letter was to Egbert Benson.

⁴The opposition to him at a former election was largely on account of his views on this question. *Jay's Jay*, I., 284, ff. For the history of his connection with the bill, see I., 390-408.

⁵For such facts and for valuable expressions of his views. Cf., *Jay's Jay*, I., 230, ff., and *Works*, III., 185, 340, ff., IV., 430-432.

test for Independence, for wise contributions to State and National Constitutions, and for important measures in the early years of the nation's life, we owe a large debt to the descendants of French Protestant refugees. Were this study to be carried through our later history, it would include the work of our second martyr President, of Gallatin, Poinsett, the Bayards, and many another. Were it to include the labors of men outside of political life, the names of Maury and Agassiz in science; of the philanthropist, Gallaudet; of the railway magnate, Chauncey Depew; of the founder of the Chautauquan movement; of the poets, Longfellow and Whittier; and—by no means least—of the Historians who have done more than all others to familiarize us with the character and heroic deeds of the Huguenots, the Baird brothers, would need to be mentioned. Nor would this exhaust the list. The longer one investigates, the clearer it is that in every honorable walk of life our Huguenot fellow-citizens have attained distinction. In any accounting for the forces that have made us, Gallic brains and character must be held to have been of incalculable value.

II. THE FRENCH CATHOLICS.

I. THE OLD NORTHWEST.

THE story of the exploration and settlement of the Northwest and the Mississippi valley by the French is one of the most romantic in our history. But it would be quite irrelevant to repeat it here. The fact of French occupancy is all that is essential for present purposes—a fact not likely soon to be forgotten, since from Lake to Gulf our national map is liberally bestrewn with names whose Gallic origin is not to be concealed even by our grotesque Anglo-Saxon mispronunciation.

When the region known as “the old Northwest” passed under the control of the United States, the population was almost entirely French.¹ Their principal settlements were Detroit and its immediate vicinity, Vincennes on the Wabash, and the Illinois villages, Kaskaskia, Cahokia, Prairie du Rocher, and Prairie du Pont. We should then expect to find marked traces of their influence on the early political life of Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois. Ohio was settled later, mostly by immigrants from the older states, so that we should hardly look to find the French a political factor in that state. In Wisconsin there were scattered forts but no extensive settlements.² Moreover that state was much later in its political development.

It is impossible to determine exactly the number of French inhabitants of the region. It is probable, however, that about the time of the French and Indian war they numbered not far from 10,000 souls, but there was considerable loss of population prior to the Revolution.³

¹King's Ohio, Chap. VIII.; Western Reserve Hist. and Arch. Tracts, No. 55, The State of Ohio—Sources of her Strength, by Chas. Whittlesey.

²See Turner, The Character and Influence of the Indian Trade in Wis., J. H. U. Studies, 1891; Draper, early French Forts in Western Wisconsin, Wis. Hist. Coll., X, 321, ff.; and Neill, Notes on Early Wis. Explorations, same Vol., 292, ff.

³I have examined a large number of reports, travellers' accounts, and histories, on this point, with no very satisfactory results. The

When Geo. Rogers Clarke made his expedition to the Illinois and Wabash regions in 1778—the expedition that secured for Virginia and hence for the United States the possession of that country—he was so fortunate as to conciliate the French priest, Father Gibault, who gave the most valuable proof of his loyalty by securing the release of Vigo. The latter, a St. Louis trader, had been taken into custody by Hamilton, though apparently without justification under the laws of war, and was held at Vincennes. Father Gibault placed himself at the head of the French inhabitants after service on Sabbath and marching to the fort threatened to cut off all supplies from the garrison unless Vigo were released. Once set free, Vigo hastened to Clark with information that enabled him to march against Hamilton with success, thus completing the conquest of that part of the territory. In the opinion of Judge Law, “Next to Clark and Vigo the United States are indebted more to Father Gibault for the accession of the states comprised in what was the original Northwest Territory than to any other man.” In view of all the circumstances, this does not seem an exaggerated estimate of the value of his services, for there can be little question that the French were in position to turn the scale in favor of either party.¹

It is not a little curious, however, that almost equal credit is due to another Frenchman, a Protestant and a son of Huguenots exiled from their historic city, LaRochele—Charles Gratiot. When the army was in danger of starvation he “made himself accountable * * to the full extent of his vast estate for

statements are contradictory and in no case based on reliable statistics. Some of the estimates are undoubtedly guess-work. Cf., Walker, *The Northwest during the Revolution*, Mich. Pioneer Coll., III., 12, ff.; Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest*, 48; Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, I., 33 and 35, with footnotes; St. Clair Papers; Scharf, *Hist. of St. Louis*, 76; Burnet, *Notes on the Northwest*, 31 and 288; and the *Histories of Randolph and St. Clair Counties, Ill.* (It is claimed that these two histories are based, so far as possible, on original data, many old and valuable MSS., both French and English, having been examined. I have found them more reliable than the ordinary county histories.)

¹Cf., Hinsdale, *Old Northwest*, 159; Law, *Address on the Colonial Hist. of Vincennes*, App. 55, ff.; Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, II. 68. Hamilton himself gives “among reasons not mentioned on the face of the capitulation * * the certainty of the inhabitants of the village having joyned the rebels.” He also pays his respects to the priest as the “wretch * * who absolved the French inhabitants from their allegiance to the King of Great Britain.” Report, Haldimand Papers, given in *Michigan Pioneer Coll.*, IX., 489, ff.

the supplies." Had it not been for this generosity, the campaign would very likely have been a disastrous failure.¹

In Michigan there was less opportunity for active sympathy with the colonies and the French took no decided stand.²

Immediately after Clark's campaign, Virginia undertook the government of the conquered country and in the fall of 1778, Col. John Todd was made County-Lieutenant. To his "Record-Book," fortunately rescued from a mass of papers used for fuel in the courthouse of Randolph County, Ill., we are indebted for the most that is certainly known about the history of the territory during his administration.³ There is nothing to indicate that the French concerned themselves much about the government, although in accordance with his instructions, Todd held an election for Judges, all of whom were chosen from among the French settlers. All the officers appointed by Todd, except Winston, the commandant at Kaskaskia, were also Frenchmen. Roosevelt says the "Judges governed their decisions solely by the old French laws and customs."⁴ One incident given in the Record-Book is fairly typical of their attitude when the task of self-government was laid upon them. During one of Todd's absences, the Judges adjourned court to what seemed to him too distant a day. "Pleasure first had always been the rule in Kaskaskia, and to compel a man to hold court when he preferred to smoke a pipe in the sun or go fishing was an unreasonable hardship." But on his return they were ordered to hold court at no distant day and doubtless complied with the demand.⁵

¹Reynolds, *Pioneer Hist. of Ill.*, 256 and 257. Washburn, who married Gratiot's grand-daughter, quotes him, *Wis. Hist. Coll.*, X., 240 and 241, so that it must have been a family tradition. Neither Gratiot nor Gibault secured any substantial reward for his services, though both made some effort to do so. In regard to Gratiot's claim, Cf., with references previously given, Billon *Annals of St. Louis*, 214 and 215, 221-225, and *Hist. of St. Clair Co.*, III., 45. In regard to Gibault's, *St. Clair Papers*, II., 179. All the French settlers were generous in support of the expedition and most of them were never reimbursed.—*St. Clair Papers*, II., 168.

²Hinsdale says, p. 159, that "in the far north the French were more favorably disposed toward the British," though "the officers complained of * * * (their) apathy." Cf., Campbell, *Early French Settlements in Mich.*, *Pioneer Coll.*, II., 95, ff. He says there were some indications of sympathy with the United States, p. 103.

³For an interesting account of the book, now in the possession of the Chicago Hist. Soc., see *Illinois in the Eighteenth Century*, 49. Its substance is given in the succeeding pages of that valuable little tract.

⁴Winning of the West, II., 171. He refers to State Dept. MSS. No. 48.

⁵*Illinois in the Eighteenth Century*, 61.

After Todd's departure in 1780 there was very little civil government, but the local officials, in imitation of practices observed among the English, indulged in gigantic land speculations, granting to each other large tracts of land under the pleasing delusion that their powers in that direction were unlimited.¹

The Virginia cession brought the territory under the direct control of the United States. The successive divisions of the territory, the different stages of territorial government, and the advance to statehood of the five commonwealths carved out between the Lakes and the Ohio, are in their general features well known. For a minute study of their national relations, recourse must be had to Congressional documents. Considering the fact the French continued for many years to be a large proportion of the population,² we should expect to find numerous and important references to them. Such an expectation is not realized, however. The student of their part in the political development of these states is compelled to learn from what can not be found rather than from what can be. Such explicit allusions to them as occur in the Annals of Congress and the State Papers of those early years may be grouped under two heads. In the first place there are acts and petitions relating to land and land titles. The Ordinance of 1787 secured to "the French and Canadian inhabitants and other settlers of the Kaskaskies, Saint Vincents, and the neighboring villages, who have heretofore professed themselves citizens of Virginia, their laws and customs now in force among them relative to the descent and conveyance of property."³ Further provision was made by acts of Congress, June 20 and August 29, 1788, for confirming in their possessions such as had professed themselves citizens of the United States or any of them on or before 1783. At the same time a tract of 400 acres was granted

¹Law, Col. Hist. of Vincennes, App., IV., 110, ff.; St. Clair Paper, II., 169; Am. State Papers, Public Lands, I., 111.; Roosevelt, Winning of the West, II., 181 and 182, referring to State Dept. MSS., 30 and 48.

²There are no exact and reliable statistics on this point. I have come to the conclusion stated after examining official lists of voters at different elections, property-holders, militia companies, and the like, and comparing them with statements found in contemporary letters. The following references are of value: The Indiana Gazetteer, 97, 98, 415; Hist. of St. Clair Co., 70, 124, 125; Mich. Pioneer Coll. I., 345, VIII., 50, ff.; 530, ff., 543, and XI., 508, ff.

³Poore, Constitutions, I., 429.

to each head of a family among such citizens.¹ There were other acts of Congress and a long series of petitions and decisions in regard to land titles, showing plainly the effect of the French system of land-tenure, and of the different grants under which lands were held, in complicating the titles. But none of these were of more importance in our national history than ordinary private land bills.²

In the second place, we find that there were petitions presented by the French settlers for the publication of the laws in their own language. But these are of interest only as showing that they were still thoroughly French and unable to understand the legal terms of the government under which they lived.³

It has sometimes been held that the French were largely responsible for the attempts to fasten slavery upon Illinois and Indiana. It is a fact that slavery was first introduced by them.⁴ It is also true that the Ordinance of 1787 was held not to be retrospective, so far as they were concerned, though many of them at first moved across the Mississippi lest they should lose their slaves under it—and in short that the validity of French slavery was never questioned.⁵

The movement for the legalization of slavery in those states appears in the national records in the form of petitions for the suspension of the sixth article of the compact. A careful examination of all the petitions, remonstrances, and reports—so far as they are printed in the public documents—discloses not the slightest reference to any French settlers as such. Two things may, however, indicate their presence and possible influence. First, there were petitions from the Illinois counties, (Randolph and St. Clair), in which the French villages

¹Journal of Cong., IV., 823, ff., and 858; St. Clair Papers, II., 165 and note.

²These decisions about land titles among the French occupy a very large space in the early State Papers on Public Lands.

Interesting particulars about land grants and titles may be found in Col. Hist. of Vincennes, App., IV., 106 and VII., 136 and 137; Mich. Pioneer Coll., I., 341, ff.; VIII., 549, ff.; XIV., 643, ff.; Hist. St. Clair Co., 74 and 75; St. Clair Papers, II., 104, ff. The lands granted to the French passed out of their hands with great rapidity.

³St. Clair Papers, II., 179. Their petitions were not granted. See Am. State Papers, Misc., II., 71.

⁴By Renault in 1720. See Reynolds, My Own Times, 207.

⁵On these points, Cf., St. Clair Papers, II., 117, ff., 119, 176, 318, 319, 330, ff.; State Papers, Public Lands, II., 103; Scharf, Hist. of St. Louis,

were located. Second, in the petition to the Fourth Congress, the petitioners say they are sure that "if the people then in the territory, (*i. e.*, in 1787), had been called upon to make such a compact, they would never have consented to enter into one that would deprive them of their most valuable property."¹ And one petition from the Legislature of Indiana recites that in 1787 slaves "were generally possessed by the citizens then inhabiting the country." Of course we know that in both those cases the original settlers were French. And it is quite clear that their presence with slaves afforded a pretext for the still further introduction of slavery. On the other hand, the reasons most urged for the suspension of the article were, that it would be better to have the black population more diffused, and especially that it was desirable to encourage immigration from the slaveholding states.²

All these attempts failed and slavery was never legalized in any part of the territory, except in so far as has been already indicated. But an effort was made to make it legal in Illinois after her admission as a state. The Constitution of 1818 had a clause prohibiting slavery "hereafter," which was so construed that slaves previously held were not liberated. Very soon Missouri became a state with slavery legalized in its borders. Emigrants from the other slave states with their negroes began to pass through Illinois on their way to the new state and were not slow to remind the people of the former

L., 272; Dunn, Indiana, 239; Mich. Pioneer Coll., XII., 511, ff. This last is a decision of Judge Woodward to the effect that slavery was legal under Jay's treaty for previous settlers. Some of the slaveholders at the time of the treaty were British, however. (T. M. Cooley, Michigan, 132.) There was also a decision in 1807 that "except as to persons in the actual possession of British settlers in the territory on the 16th of June, 1796," "a right of property in the human species can not exist." (Mich. Pioneer Coll., XII., 519, ff. It is printed from the MSS. opinion of the Chief Justice in the possession of Mich. Hist. Soc.) It cannot have been true therefore in Mich., however it may have been in other states, that slavery was permitted for the special benefit of the French.

¹State Papers, Public Lands, I., 61. The four signers of this petition "for and on behalf of" the people of those counties were none of them French. They petitioned also the 6th and the 9th Congress. (Annals 6th Cong., 735, and 9th Cong., 848). Dunn says the signatures to the petition to the 6th Cong., 270 in number, were mostly French. He refers to the original on the Senate files. (Indiana, 298).

²Annals 9th Congress as above; State Papers, Misc., I., 467. See also speeches of Douglas and Chase on the compromise measures of 1850. (Cong. Globe, 31st Cong., 1st sess., App., 364, ff., and 468, ff.) Both of them dwell at some length on these early attempts to legalize slavery but neither of them alludes to the French settlers. Douglas says, p. 369, that "the people were mostly from the slaveholding states."

that the constitutional enactment concerning slavery alone prevented their remaining east of the Mississippi.¹ Beside this many of those already settled in Illinois were from slave states and felt that slavery would be an advantage to them.² An attempt was therefore made to procure a Convention for the amendment of the Constitution in the interests of slavery. The movement was precipitated by the Governor's recommendation of a law for the liberation of slaves held by the French.³ But when the vote was taken St. Clair County gave the heaviest vote against it, and that vote was decisive.⁴ It is hardly probable that the French settlers voted against the measure. Indeed, Brown says, they were "the natural allies of the conventionists and desirous of their success." But I have found no evidence that they inaugurated the movement or that when it was once begun they were very active in its support. The brief outline that is here given covers the essential features of both the earlier and the later movements so far as they relate to the subject in hand. And it seems to indicate that the presence of French slavery was made a pretext by later settlers for pressing a demand for the legalization of the institution. Further, we must infer—it is mainly inference—that when it came to political action the French acted, so far as they overcame their inertia enough to act at all, with the supporters of slavery. But "the active and dangerous championship of slavey in the Northwest did not come from the French inhabitants."⁵ Moreover, the history of the Kansas struggle suggests the strong probability that had there been no French slavery, no toleration of it as an inheritance from former claimants of the territory, border states like Illinois and Indiana would not have escaped a contest upon the subject. It is noticeable in this connection that, not only did the northern states, Michigan and Wisconsin,

¹Brown, *Early Movement in Ill. for the Legalization of Slavery*, 16 and 17. Brown was a participant in the struggle and therefore must have known its causes. See also Wilson, *Hist. of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power*, I., 163.

²*Early Western Days*, by J. T. Kingston; Wis. Hist. Coll., 295, ff. See 298, ff., and 313, ff., for an account of the slavery movement. Kingston's father was a resident of Kaskaskia at the time and he himself was old enough to have some personal recollections of the matter. Cf., 333.

³Brown, *Hist. Sketch*, 20.

⁴*Early Western Days*, 315.

⁵Hinsdale, *Old Northwest*, 351.

have no such struggle, but that the other *border* state of the Northwest, Ohio, was the object of desire on the part of slaveholders.¹ Furthermore, there are indications that slaves were actually introduced into Illinois and Indiana by other than French settlers.² It is therefore highly probable that the location of Illinois and Indiana had much more to do with the efforts to legalize slavery in their borders than had French influence.

The local government of the Northwestern states, by the provisions of the Ordinance was copied from the older states, and there is no evidence that it received any important modifications from French ideas. In so far as the older states were Anglo-Saxon in their local institutions these were also.³

It has already been mentioned that Todd's appointments to office were mostly from the French and the same is true of St. Clair's early appointments, but he speaks of the difficulty of finding persons "in any degree qualified to hold the necessary offices." In the succeeding years of his administration French names are less frequent in the lists of officers.⁴ In later history the records show surprisingly few French names.⁵ And when the State Constitutions were formed there were hardly

¹Burnet, *Notes on the Northwest*, 306. They were Va. officers who wished to remain with their slaves on the bounty lands in Ohio. The Ordinance and the state of public feeling in Ohio, it will be remembered, had received large immigration from New England—prevented.

²From statistics in Niles' Register, I., 388 and 389, I find that in Knox Co., Ind., in which the French settlers were located—the slaves were 28 in 1800, 135 in 1810. Now as the American population was gaining, the French declining, this increase of slaves could not be from further French immigration. As it obviously was not simply their natural increase, they must have been introduced by the Americans. Still further, the other counties, Clark and Harrison, which were unsettled in 1800, had 102 slaves in 1810. St. Clair Co., Ill., had none in 1800, 4 in 1810. Randolph Co., on the other hand had 107 in 1800, 12 in 1810.

³See Howard, *Local Cons. Hist. of the U. S.*; Shaw, *Local Government in Ill.* (*J. H. U. Studies, First Series*); Bemis *Local Govt. in Mich.*, (*J. H. U. Studies, First Series*); Spencer *Local Gov't in Wis.* (*Wis. Hist. Coll.*, XI., 502, ff.). Cf., the Constitutions in Poore.

⁴St. Clair Papers, II., 172 for quotation. For lists of appointments, I, 131, 311, 322, 323, 324, 336, 344, and footnotes.

⁵Many of the authorities consulted give lists of Territorial and early state officers. Among others, Atwater's *Ohio*; Tuttle's *Michigan*; Histories of Randolph and St. Clair counties; Mich. Pioneer Coll., I. and VIII. In pursuance of an act of the Mich. Leg., S. D. Bingham compiled a volume of Mich. Biographies, in 1888, "to preserve in compact form the record of Statesmen, Judges, and Legislators of Mich." It is very noticeable that the French names are very few. Some that do appear are of immigrants from the eastern states, one at least being of Huguenot descent. See p. 223.

any men of French parentage in the conventions.¹ One Frenchman, Father Gabriel Richards of Detroit, was chosen Territorial Delegate—in 1823—from Michigan, though singularly enough his support was only in small part from the French. During his term he exerted himself in behalf of the Indian tribes of the Northwest and at his instance appropriations were made for the opening of several roads leading into Detroit, thus hastening the material development of the region. His services were so satisfactory that he would have been re-elected had not his own countrymen defeated him—though only by about half a dozen votes—from the notion that a priest had no business in a legislative body.² This incident points to united action on the part of the French. And as late as 1831, a meeting was held at Frenchtown to endorse the nomination of Austin E. Wing as Delegate to Congress, which was evidently a meeting of Frenchmen and intended to influence French votes.³ Various scattered and indirect allusions tend to confirm the idea that when they did rouse themselves to political action they “pulled together.”⁴

But while the direct and positive influence of these people was so slight, they were, nevertheless, a factor to be reckoned with. The great divergences of their customs from those of the Americans caused many inconveniences. Though they are almost uniformly represented to have been well disposed toward the United States government and to have become faithful and attached citizens,⁵ there were frequent complaints from them

¹The Constitution of Indiana is, with signatures, in Nile's Register, XLII., 85, ff., of Ill., in XV., 93, ff., and of Mich., in XLVIII., 345, ff. It is to be remembered, too, that the region had not been long enough settled by Americans to have given men of mixed parentage to the conventions, even if intermarriages at an early day had been more frequent than there is reason to suppose.

²Life and Times of Rev. Gabriel Richards, by J. A. Girardin, Mich. Pioneer Coll., I., 481, ff.

³Mich. Pioneer Coll., XII., 569 and 570. They say they look upon Wing “as a genuine republican, educated in the Jeffersonian school.” He was the man who defeated Richards at a former election.

⁴Much of the material upon which positive conclusions on this point might be based is either entirely lost or is at present inaccessible. It is much to be desired that local investigators should hunt out and make available all such bits of local history. Until this is thoroughly done, a complete political history of the Northwest cannot be written, and one's conclusions on some vital points must be merely tentative. I have endeavored, however, to weigh carefully all the evidence within my reach. Such as it is, it points to the conclusion I have indicated.

⁵Cf., Tuttle, Hist. of Mich., 114 and 115; St. Clair Papers, II., 27, 31,

of the changed order of things in legal matters. To wait "the slow, tedious progress of an American court" was felt to be a hardship by a people accustomed to the summary decision of a Commandant.¹ And the American judges experienced so much difficulty from being unacquainted with the *coutume de Paris* that Judge Woodward suggested the desirability of a small representative body to be associated with them, that they might better understand the feelings of the people in regard to proposed changes.²

They were also easily impressed with the idea that some of their cherished customs would be interfered with. A suggestion by Judge Symmes to the Detroit Grand Jury that it was not needful to spend so much time in their religious duties was supposed by some to be an "attempt to put down their religion," and the Judge was obliged to make an explanation from the bench.³ Taxes, too, were an abomination to them. In 1802, Sibley wrote to Judge Burnet: "Nothing frightens the Canadians like taxes. They would prefer to be treated like dogs and kenneled under the whip of a tyrant, than to contribute to the support of a free government."⁴ And in 1809, some of the inhabitants of Michigan having petitioned for a change to the next grade of government, sent a second petition retracting the first one, saying they made it "without duly considering and understanding the subject," and that "their number is still too small for the second grade of government * * * or any other which would subject them to any expense in supporting a Legislature." There are no signatures to this paper, but the letter accompanying it says: "The most numerous class of the inhabitants, who are Canadians," are "totally opposed" to a change of Government and also the majority of the Americans."⁵

But the most noticeable peculiarity of the French, politi-

and 33: Patrick Henry's letter of instructions to Todd, (given in Hist. of Randolph Co., 90, ff.) Mich. Pioneer Coll., I., 361, VII., 510, f., II., 103; The Red Book of Mich., 436. For a different view, see Early Western Days, 299, ff.

¹Burnet, Notes on the Northwest, 282, footnote; Col. Hist. of Vincennes, 42; Volney's View, 372.

²Am. State Papers, Misc., I., 461. This was in 1806.

³Notes on the Northwest, 282, footnote.

⁴The letter is in App., II., of Burnet's Notes.

⁵The petition and letter are in Mich. Pioneer Coll., VIII., 594, ff.

cally speaking, was their unwillingness and unfitness to assume the duties of citizenship. When Volney visited Vincennes in the last century, the Americans there complained to him that the French "understand nothing of political, civil or domestic affairs. * * * Their first demand was for a commanding officer, and it was the most difficult thing possible to make them comprehend anything of a municipal administration chosen by and from among themselves. Even now they have no persons fit for forming one."¹ This political inertia is mentioned by nearly every writer. And in one notable instance their unwillingness to assume the duties of self-government retarded by nearly a decade the political advancement of a commonwealth. In 1818 it was found that the population of Michigan was sufficient for the second grade of government, but the proposition to establish it was voted down by a large majority, and it was not till 1827 that it was secured. The defeat is ascribed on good authority to French votes. Says Campbell, speaking of their lack of political training under a paternal government: "Those who reached middle age before the people of the Territory became entitled to vote for their own officers were not always pleased with the change, and some of those who survived to a very recent period never ceased to sigh for the good old days when the commanding officer was the whole government."²

* ¹View of Climate and Soil of the U. S., 373, ff.

²Political Hist. of Mich., 392. The book was published in 1876. The author's opportunities for learning the facts from those who were active in political life at the time make his testimony on such points especially valuable.

II. THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE.

TURNING now to the regions included in the Louisiana purchase, we find that there also the population was predominantly French when the United States obtained control.¹ From the first there was jealousy between the French and American citizens. Laussat, the prefect who had handed over the government to the United States, thought the errors of our government could hardly have been worse.² It is possible that the dissatisfaction of the French was manufactured or at least fostered by him and other officials. At any rate there *was* considerable dissatisfaction. No sooner had Congress made provision for the temporary government of the Territory of New Orleans, than the people of the territory remonstrated.³ They show in this remonstrance an unwillingness that former customs and laws should be changed as well a feeling that they were not being dealt with according to the terms of the cession. They also request the appointment of officials who can speak the French language. The narrative of events at that time, as given by Gayarre, tends to the impression that intriguing politicians of American birth had gained an ascendancy over the Creoles and were using this dissatisfaction for their own ends. The Territory was organized under the terms of the act, notwithstanding their objections, but early in 1805 by a further act⁴ they were put on

¹Clairborne reported to the Sec. of State, in 1809, that there were, by a census taken in 1806, 52,998 inhabitants. The white population was 26,069, of whom at least 13,000 were natives mostly of French descent, about 3,500 natives of the U. S., the rest mostly Europeans, part of them French. The letter is quoted by Gayarre, *Louisiana under Am. Domination*, 211, ff. Jefferson's report to Cong., *Annals*, 8 Cong., 2 sess., 1506, gives somewhat different estimates, but they are confessedly not exact.

²His report to the French government, in which he instances some things which he thinks might have been better done, is quoted by Gayarre, 7, ff.

³The remonstrance presented to the Senate may be found in *Annals*, 8 Cong., 2 sess., App., 1597. That to the House, 1608, ff.

⁴*Annals*, 8 Cong., 2 sess., App., 1674, ff.

nearly the same footing as other Territories. Concerning this change, Claiborne wrote: "The people have been taught to expect greater privileges and many are disappointed. I believe, however, as much is given them as they can manage or as they ought to be trusted with until the limits of the ceded territory are acknowledged, the national attachments of our new brothersless wavering, and the views and character of some influential men here better ascertained."¹

But notwithstanding some complaints and jealousies of the Americans, there is no reason to think that the French were at heart disloyal. In 1806 Claiborne wrote of them: "My opinion of the native Louisianians has always been the same; a majority are well disposed, and were it not for the calumnies of some Frenchmen who are among us, and the intrigues of a few ambitious, unprincipled men whose native language is English, I do believe that the Louisianians would be very soon the most zealous and faithful members of our Republic." He adds, however, "Until a knowledge of the American government, laws, and character is more generally diffused among the people you cannot with certainty count upon their fidelity."²

At the time of the Burr conspiracy, the Legislative Council were "convinced that it is not among the ancient inhabitants of this territory that proselytes had been made to such a project and that there was no perfidy, no treason to be apprehended from them."³

Disloyalty was indeed alleged against them in the war of 1812 but with insufficient reason. Half the Committee of Public Defense for New Orleans in 1814 were French.⁴ And "if New Orleans and the Creoles had been unpatriotic, Gen. Jackson would have been at their mercy."⁵

The same peculiarities that marked the French of the Northwest are to be found also among these Creoles. They

¹Quoted from *Ex. Jour.* by Gayarre, 67.

²Quoted by Gayarre from *Ex. Jour.*, 159.

³Quoted by Gayarre, 177.

⁴See signatures to their address to the people, Latour's *Hist. of the War in West Florida and Louisiana*, App., XIV.

⁵Maurice Thompson, *Hist. of Louisiana*, 215. See also his discussion of the whole subject, 211, ff. He speaks of the services of French volunteers and of French women who did brave work as hospital nurses. His opinion is that disloyalty was rather against state than U. S. government. Cf. Ingersoll, *Hist. of the War in 1812*, IV., Chap. II. His conclusions seem to be substantially the same as Thompson's.

petitioned for the use of their own language by officials.¹ were unable readily to reconcile themselves to the slow administration of justice and to trial by jury and great difficulties arose in the adjustment of land titles.² The same unwillingness to be taxed and the same indifference to the right of citizenship may be seen also. In 1808 the Legislative Council said that the people "felt the imposition of taxes as a great hardship." And a year later Claiborne urged that feeling and their neglect of political duties as reasons why they should not assume the task of self-government. He quotes from "a very respectable and influential planter" that "the taxes already imposed by the Territorial government were as great as the people could conveniently meet and that no change was for the present desirable." As to their political inactivity, he instances cases where less than thirty out of two hundred voters exercised the right of suffrage, and says "it has seldom happened that at any election, however contested, a majority of the voters have attended the polls."³

The question whether the ordinance of 1787 was applicable to Louisiana came up in 1805 and agents for the inhabitants argued that it was not.⁴ Its principles must have been particularly distasteful to them. But the enabling act of 1811 required some of the provisions, which the ordinance had secured to the people of the Northwest, to be incorporated in the Constitution; the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty, trial by jury in criminal cases, and the privilege of *habeas corpus*.⁵

Of the forty members of the Constitutional Convention in 1812, twenty-two were of French origin; and of the seven who drafted the Constitution, four were French, if the indications of name can be trusted.⁶ Some slight traces of their probable

¹See remonstrance before alluded to and Am. State Papers, Misc., II., 51 and 52.

²Breckenridge, Views of Louisiana, 143 and 144. His book, published in 1814, was founded on observations made in his own travels. This Chap., VI., is also printed in Niles' Reg., I., 243. ff., so that it must have been written as early as 1811. On land titles see State Papers, Public Lands, II.

³These various quotations may be found in Gayarre, 192, 211. ff.

⁴State Papers, Misc., I., 418.

⁵Poore, I., 699. For opinions as to their unfitness for self government, see debates in Cong. in 1804. Benton's Abr., III.

⁶Marbois, Hist. of Louisiana, 339, and Gayarre, 272.

influence appear in the Constitution, noticeably the large property qualifications for some official positions, and the exclusion from office of any "clergyman, priest or teacher of any religious persuasion, society, or sect."¹ That in general features it should be like those of the older states, was necessary to secure the assent of Congress.

It is well known that the Louisiana Code is founded largely on the Code Napoleon. But the Common Law is so universally accepted in the United States that, while the Civil Law has to be recognized in suits concerning Louisiana, it has had no appreciable effect on the jurisprudence of the country at large.²

A majority of the members selected for the legislative Council of the early Territorial government were taken from among the Creoles and in the early history of the state they had the principal voice in the towns and a majority in the legislature.³ Out of the first eight governors, three were of French origin. As late as 1859 there had been but one gubernatorial election in which at least one of the candidates was not a Frenchman.⁴ But the only man of mark among these early officials was Francois Xavier Martin, the jurist and historian.

The Frenchmen of the Northwest and the Mississippi valley then were, as a rule, patriotic and peaceable citizens.⁵ They have added numerous picturesque features to our history and our landscapes. They still furnish us bits of dreamy European and mediaeval life in the midst of our wide-awake, progressive, nineteenth century, American civilization. The New Orleans of today is a foreign and an old-time city, while mediaeval France yet lingers in the Illinois country. Little more than a decade since, a traveler to that region said of Kaskaskia, there "is little to disturb the impression that it is still the Kaskaskia of the olden time," and of Prairie du Rocher,

¹Poore, L. 702.

²Some account of the "Digest of Civil Laws" of 1808 and some interesting particulars of the growth of jurisprudence may be found in Louisiana Hist. Coll., Part II., 22-25. But for the material on which this paragraph is founded I am especially indebted to Hon. W. S. Pattee, of the Law School of the Univ. of Minn., who kindly gave me information not accessible in print.

³Gayarre, 19 and 68. Breckenridge, 139; Martin in a letter of July 22, 1818, an extract from which is given in Hist. Mag., VIII., 241. ff.

⁴See table of popular votes for Gov., 1812-1864, Hist. Mag., IX., 373.

⁵Reynolds, My Own Times, 79, says they were never intemperate in

"It is as if a piece of old France had been transplanted to the Mississippi a century since and forgotten; or as if a stratum of the early French settlements at the Illinois a hundred years ago or more had sunk down below the reach of time and change, and with its ways and customs and people still intact had still pursued its former life unmindful of the busy nineteenth century on the uplands above its head."¹

Again the records of early explorations and early history that have come to us through them are of much value. Much of our knowledge of Indian habits and language are from the same sources. And when the minute details of local history in the Northwest and the Mississippi valley have been fully investigated, it will probably be found that many episodes in that history were due to their presence, their customs, or their idioms of language—as was the case with the Iowa and Missouri boundary war. But their contribution, in any large sense, to the political development of those regions can not be reckoned of vital importance. Their political activity—what there was of it—was mainly in the line of opposition to the unfamiliar ideas of an advancing civilization. At some points they may have stayed for a little time—and only for a little time—the chariot wheels of progress. But for that fact, they might almost be omitted in writing the political history of our country.

drink, that they rarely engaged in common broils or personal combats, and that no Creole was ever hung or sentenced to the penitentiary in Ill. For interesting particulars about their customs, see Chaps. VIII. and XII. of his book; Monnette, *Hist. of the Miss. Valley*, I., 181, ff.; Burnet, *Notes on the Northwest*, 281, ff. footnote; Reynolds' *Pioneer Hist. of Ill.*; Maria Hamlin, *Legends of Le Detroit: Old French Traditions* (same author); Mich. Coll., IV., 70, f. Wallace, *Illinois and Louisiana under French Rule*, last chapter; Scharf, *Hist. of St. Louis*, Chap. XII. I consider the last the most satisfactory account.

¹Illinois in the Eighteenth Century, 21 and 45.

COMPARISON AND CONCLUSION.

In reviewing and comparing the facts adduced in the foregoing study, the two main lines of French immigration to this country present a striking contrast. The Huguenot—as a Huguenot, a Frenchman—is and has been for many a decade practically forgotten.¹ His descendants speak the same language as the descendants of the Puritan and the Cavalier. They mingle with them in the mart, the Senate House, and the place of worship, and are practically undistinguishable from them.² No peculiarity of costume or manner calls attention to them as a people of alien race. The worthy deeds of their Revolutionary ancestors are reckoned to the credit of the Anglo-Saxon race, and the very Constitution that those ancestor did so much to fashion and the national career that owed so much of its early success to their guidance are vaunted as the peculiar glories of the same race. That our debt to the Huguenots is a great one is a fact that does not lie upon the surface history. It is indeed only beginning to be recognized.

The traveller through the Atlantic states must needs look carefully to find traces of these early French immigrants; the traveller in certain parts of the Northwest and of Louisiana must needs close his eyes, if he would forget the fact of French occupancy.

But the peculiar feature of the contrast is, that the Huguenot who *seems* to have disappeared and left no trace behind him, proves on careful investigation to have made a mighty impress upon our national history, the records of which fill many of the most valuable and fascinating pages of our public documents; while the Frenchman of the Northwest,

¹The organization of the Huguenot Soc. and the researches of individuals have done much of late years to call them to mind, but for most people, the fact stated in the text is doubtless still true.

²There are still a few Huguenot churches in the U. S., the most important being in N. Y. city and in Charleston, S. Car. For some particulars, see Introd. to Vol. I. of Huguenot Coll. and Bi-Centenary Commemoration, 8, 51, 63, 65, and 68. Their very existence is probably unknown to the majority of well informed people.

whose picturesque and romantic memorials are so abundant, has left no enduring mark and the pages of the national records in which he appears are of little value in the study of our growth into a nation.

It is a pertinent and perhaps a timely question, why this difference? Why should people of the same race, coming to the new world at so nearly the same time, differ so widely in their influence upon the young nation of which they became a part?

To some the off-hand, easy answer may seem to be the true one. "The Huguenot was Protestant, therefore progressive; the other was Catholic, therefore reactionary." But an answer based on hasty generalization and religious prejudice cannot be accepted as final; especially as on the surface of history there is no evidence that the moving force of Hamilton's career, for instance, was an absorbing devotion to Protestantism.

On the other hand, there can be no question that the Protestant Reformation in France was a mighty link in the chain of causes that have led to our national greatness. The Huguenots were tested and sifted by fierce religious persecutions, and when at last the infamous Revocation drove them from their native land, it was verily a chosen remnant that sought these western wilds. Let Pilgrim or Puritan boast—as he may—of the zeal for religious freedom that exiled him from home, the Huguenot can point to yet a nobler record of unswerving devotion to principle.

Yet further, it was not true, as it has been so often elsewhere from the days of the primitive church onward, that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble were called;" the best blood of France flowed in the veins of the original Huguenots, and when they came to America, "they brought with them * * an ancestral influence of education, refinement, and skillful enterprise, as well as of religious fidelity."¹

Hence if the doctrine of heredity be admitted to have any force, we may partly understand how the graceful diplomat upholding his country's honor with skillful tact at a court where all was chaos should be of a race celebrated for its ease

¹R. S. Storrs, *The Early American Spirit and the Genesis of it*, 51; see, also, an eloquent passage in Schafl's address on the Hist. of the Edict of Nantes, Huguenot Proceedings, II., 101, ff., and another in H. M. Baird's address at the Bi-Centenary, p. 38.

and polish of manners; how the founder of our financial prosperity should be descended from a race of people renowned for their success in amassing wealth; and above all how the successful statesman who carried his honor so unsullied through all his political life that "when the spotless robe of the judicial ermine fell upon him, it touched nothing less spotless than itself," should trace his ancestry to a refugee to whom freedom of conscience and loyalty to principle were even dearer than was the historic city so beloved by every Protestant in France.

Their influence has been altogether disproportioned to their numbers, for in "determining the character of a country, a hundred selected men and women are more potent than a thousand men and women taken at random."¹

The French of the Northwest and the Mississippi valley were of an altogether different type and their occupancy of the country was due to far other causes. Whether from the lower strata of society, or as in some cases from the higher grades, they were uneducated and unused to self-government. They were in general well disposed, cheerful, contented, often industrious and enterprising in business ventures. Yet on the whole, their virtues were those of the slave rather than of the freeman. "An ignorant population, sprung from a brave and active race, but trained to subjection and dependence through centuries of feudal and monarchical despotism, was planted in the wilderness by the hand of authority and told to grow and flourish."² They could obey unquestioningly the command of priest or governor. To think, to decide for themselves, and then to follow loyally, if need be heroically, the dictates of reason and of conscience was entirely foreign to their habits.

In these contrasting types of character is to be found the first and probably the most potent cause of the remarkable contrast in their influence on American history. That a people brave, refined, intelligent, loyal to principle, sifted by long and fierce persecutions, fleeing to the New World solely that they might be free to follow the very highest ideals, should have

¹Fiske's *Beginnings of New England*, 47.

To understand fully the influence of the Huguenots on Am. history one must know something of their own early history and heroic struggles. In this view, *The Rise of the Huguenots in France*, and *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, by Prof. H. M. Baird, are valuable contributions to American History.

²Parkman. *The Old Regime in Canada*, 394.

proved one of the most powerful factors in national development is not at all surprising. That a people of a low grade of intelligence and wholly untrained in the art of self-government, should have neither the desire nor the ability to be an active force in nation-building, is also not surprising. So far as these types of character were determined by differences of religion, so far has the Protestantism of the one, the Catholicism of the other contributed to the result.

But while difference of character counts for so much in the solution of the problem, another factor must also be reckoned with, namely: the different circumstances under which these two off-shoots from the French race entered into our national life. The Huguenot became an American citizen before the "formative period" of our history. The time and the circumstances favored his throwing himself as a vitalizing force into the political life that was just beginning to be. The Frenchman of the Northwest became an American citizen by the issues of war, and the Louisiana Creole by purchase. In both cases, an already organized government extended its sway over him. He was not asked nor expected to take part in it, except under established conditions, and his remonstrances and petitions were, as a rule, dismissed or unfavorably reported on. It was the intention to arrange matters for all newly acquired territory in accordance with principles previously determined. Habituated to altogether different methods of government, unfamiliar with democratic ideas, untrained in political thinking, the new citizen had small chance to make himself felt.

To character, then, must be added opportunity as having favored the political influence of the Huguenot. To lack of opportunity may be attributed in some degree the want of political influence on the part of the French Catholic.

Yet another element must be noted - an element, however, that is perhaps the resultant of the two already mentioned - the complete and rapid absorption of the Huguenot in the mass of the American people. "Sooner than any other, and more completely, they became American in speech, conviction, and habits of thought."¹ This complete absorption, which has tended to make them forgotten as Huguenots while they are

¹Roosevelt, *What Americanism Means*, Forum, Apr., 1894, p. 205. Cf. address of Richard Olney in Bi-Centenary Commemoration, 82, ff.

gratefully remembered as American patriots and statesmen, probably contributed very largely to their political influence. Because they were so early and so completely Americanized, there was no occasion for race jealousies and antipathies; they had no French notions to import into governmental methods; they did not act unitedly as a faction but individually as citizens devoted to the best interests of their adopted country. That thus acting, the leading men among them—almost without exception—worked for the same ends, and especially for greater centralization of government points strongly in the direction of an inherited race tendency.

The Canadian and the Creole on the other hand, were not absorbed nor assimilated. Even after the influx of American immigrants intermarriages were for a long time infrequent. Indeed their assimilation was more often with the Red Man than with other European settlers. Slowly and unwillingly they assumed the rights and duties of American citizens, clinging all the while tenaciously to their own customs and language. Had they been a more aggressive people politically than they were, they could not thus as aliens have forced the ideas of a decadent old-world despotism upon a vigorous and growing young nation.

Many minor causes were doubtless contributory to the result; more extended investigations may yet reveal other important causes; but the facts at present accessible emphasize these three, difference in character, in opportunity and in ability to be assimilated. And they are amply sufficient to account for the observed differences in result.

To the Canadian and the Creole, we owe gratitude for patriotic services; for much of the material development of the regions that they were the first white men to enter; for a great part of the romance of western history; and for picturesque survivals; but for political development, almost nothing.

To the Huguenot we must be grateful, that while bringing no new political inventions, he brought *himself*, and gave himself with all his heritage of character and ability to the new nation, working with energy, persistence, and success to make the best political ideas of the age supreme in its Constitution and potent in its development.

* * * * *

Of late years we are having another influx of French

immigrants, this time threatening to overwhelm Puritan New England with a Catholic population from across the Canadian borders. It is yet too soon to determine the effect of this migration, but it has caused grave concern to many observers. It is but a part of the general problem of foreign immigration—than which no other question is of more vital importance. The facts herewith presented point by an easy inference to a speedy and complete transformation of the immigrant from an alien into an American with American habits of thought, as one of the essential principles for its solution.

APPENDIX.

GENEALOGICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

BAYARD.—The Pedigree of the American family is supposed to have been traced to Balthazar Bayard, whose ancestors fled from Dauphine about the time of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. There were also families of the name in Champagne, Languedoc, and Flanders.

Cf. Am. Ancestry, III., 79, and Mag. of Am. Hist., XVII. The latter is an answer to the doubt raised by Arthur Richmond in N. Am. Review, Jan. 1885, as to the Huguenot ancestry of the family.

BENEZET.—Anthony Benezet was born in St. Quentin in 1713. The family fled from persecution to Holland. Thence they went to London and afterwards to Philadelphia. Anthony joined the Quakers at the age of 14. His life was mostly spent in religious and philanthropic labors.

See brief biography prefixed to Views on Slavery.

BREVARD.—Ephraim Brevard is generally admitted to have been of Huguenot descent, but I cannot trace his ancestry. He was born in Maryland in 1744; went to N. Carolina when about 4 years of age; graduated at Princeton in 1768; was later a surgeon in the army; was made prisoner at the surrender of Charleston and died from the effects of his imprisonment. He was secretary of the Mecklinburg Convention, and the resolutions differed but slightly from his draft.

Hunter, Sketches of Western Life in North Carolina, 47 and 48.

BOUDINOT.—A family of this name came to Mass. The name is found in the records of Oxford. They probably moved to one of the middle states. The Elias Boudinot known to American history was born in Philadelphia, Apr. 21, 1740. His grand-father, also named Elias, came to America in 1686.

Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., XXII., 51; Sketch of Elias Boudinot by Helen Boudinot Stryker, Penn. Mag. III., 191.

BOWDOIN.—Pierre Bowdoin, said to have been a physician of Rochelle, fled to America at the time of the Revocation and settled in Casco, Maine, probably in 1687. His grand-son, James, was the distinguished Governor of Mass. Gov. Bowdoin's daughter, Elizabeth, married Sir Wm. Temple, and *her* daughter Elizabeth married Thos. L. Winthrop, from whom Robt. Winthrop was descended. The direct line ended with Gov. Bowdoin's son James—the founder of Bowdoin Col.—but

some of the descendants of his sister Elizabeth assumed the name.

See Mass. Hist. Soc., Coll., XXV., 49, 50, and 78; New Eng. Hist. and Gen. Reg., X., 78, and VIII., 247.

There were Bowdoin's in Virginia, probably descended from John Bowdoin, a brother of James, who moved to that state about 1700, (Va. Hist. Coll., Vol. V., p. XI., footnote.)

FANEUIL.—Three brothers, Andrew, Benjamin, and John Faneuil, settled in Boston as early as 1699. John returned to France. Peter, the donor of Faneuil Hall, was a son of Benjamin, but received his large fortune from his uncle Andrew.

Cf. Mass. Hist. Soc. Col XXII., 53, Mem. Hist. of Boston, II., 554; and the chapter on "The French Protestants of Boston" in the latter volume.

GALLATIN.—Schaff. (Huguenot Proceedings, I., 95), and other writers speak of Albert Gallatin as of Huguenot descent. The truth seems to be that the family, though Protestant and close allies of Calvin, were hardly refugees for the faith. They moved from Savoy to Geneva in 1510.

See App. to H. Adams' edition of his Writings and Adams' Life of Gallatin, Book I.

GALLAUDET.—Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet, the founder of the first institution in America for the education of deaf-mutes, was descended from Pierre Elise Gallaudet—one of the earliest settlers of New Rochelle—whose wife, Margaret Crezot, was a descendant of the 94th Doge of Venice. For interesting particulars concerning him and his work, see Bi-Centenary Commemoration, 74, ff.

GRATIOT.—Charles Gratiot was the son of Huguenot parents who fled from La Rochelle on the Revocation. They took up their residence at Lausanne, Switzerland, where Charles was born in 1753. He received a mercantile education in London and came while quite young to Canada to engage in the fur trade. In 1774 he settled in Cahokia. After the Revolution he moved to St. Louis, where he married a daughter of Pierre Choteau. Henry Gratiot, his son, was the father of Mrs. E. B. Washburne.

See Wis. Hist. Coll., Vol. X., articles by Hon. E. B. Washburne and Mrs. Adele Gratiot; Scharf, Hist. of St. Louis, I. 287; Billon, Annals of St. Louis, 214, ff.

HAMILTON.—Alexander Hamilton was born in the West Indies and came at an early age to N. Y. There is some obscurity about his parentage, but I am not aware that anyone has ever seriously questioned his descent on his mother's side from a Huguenot family who took refuge in the West Indies. A discussion of his ancestry may be found in Lodge's Life of Hamilton, App. A.

JAY.—Augustus Jay, one of the numerous exiles from the

city of Rochelle, settled in New York in 1697. He married a daughter of Balthazar Bayard. Their son, Peter, married a daughter of Jacobus Van Courtland, by whom he had ten children. John was the eighth, born in N. Y., Dec. 12, 1745. It will be noticed that none of his ancestors had intermarried with the English, so that he was of French and Dutch blood.

See Jay's Jay, Chap. I.

MARION.—The ancestors of Francis Marion came from La Chaume. C. W. Baird, (II., 52 and footnote), gives this fact, referring to *Liste de Francois et Suisses refugiez en Caroline*. See also Mass. Hist. Coll. XXII., 56.

LAURENS.—The ancestors of Henry Laurens were French Protestant Refugees who first settled in N. Y. and moved thence to Charleston.

See Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., XXII., 55.

MANIGAULT.—Gabriel Manigault was descended from Peter Manigault, who went from Rochelle to England in 1685 and came to Carolina about 1696. See Am. Ancestry, V. 35, ff. and Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., XXII. 55.

A Dr. Gabriel Manigault, presumably a direct descendant, is one of the Ex. Com. of the S. Car. Huguenot Soc.

See Transactions, No. 3.

MORRIS.—The mother of Gouverneur Morris was one of the Huguenot Gouverneurs who settled in N. Y. after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

See Roosevelt's Life of Morris, 2.

REVERE.—The Revere or Rivier family was one of the oldest in Europe—may be traced, perhaps to the time of the first crusade. They lived in Dauphine and had large estates and many titles of nobility. Paul Revere was the son of Apollos, a Huguenot who went from France to the island of Guernsey and thence to Boston.

See Am. Ancestry, V. 41, and Goss's Life of Revere, Chap. I. Goss also has an article on Revere in Mag. of Am. Hist., Jan. 1886.

SEVIER.—John Sevier came of a Huguenot family named Xavier, though his immediate ancestors were from England.

See Phelan, Hist. of Tenn., p. 72, and Roosevelt, Winning of the West, I., 180-183.

TYLER.—Anne Contesse, a Huguenot, was the mother of Gov. Tyler and the grandmother of Pres. Tyler.

See Va. Hist., Coll. V., Introd.

VINCENT.—The pedigree of Bishop Vincent may be found in Am. Ancestry, VIII, 25. It is traced to a refugee who settled in New Jersey.

WHITTIER.—The poet Whittier's maternal grandmother was Sarah Greenleaf. The Greenleaf family were from

France, the name being originally Feuillevert, which was translated as so many other Huguenot names have been into English.

See Linton's *Life of Whittier* and *Bi-Centenary Com.* 70.

It is a somewhat curious fact that the first white men in Minn., so far as can be learned, were two Huguenots engaged in the fur trade. Medard Chouart, known as *Sieur Groseliers*, and Pierre d'Esprit, known as *Sieur Radisson*.

See Rev. E. D. Neill's *Hist. of the upper Miss. Valley*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Adams, John, Life and works. C. F. Adams; Boston, 1856.
- American Ancestry. Hughes, T. P.; Albany, 1887-1893.
- American Biography, Cyclopedia of; edited by J. G. Wilson and John Fiske, New York, 1887.
- American Biography, National Cyclopedia of; N. Y. 1892.
- American Genealogy, J. B. Holgate; Albany, 1848.
- American spirit, The Early and the Genesis of it; R. S. Storrs, D. D., N. Y., 1878.
- American Conflict, The, Horace Greeley; Hartford, 1864.
- American Archives; Washington, 1833-1837.
- American State Papers, Washington.
- Annals of Congress, Washington.
- Annals of America, Abiel Holmes; Cambridge, 1829.
- Atlantic Monthly, Vols. LV. LVII.
- Boston, Memorial History of, edited by Justin Winsor, Boston, 1882.
- Bowdoin, James, A Memorial Address by R. C. Winthrop; Boston, 1849.
- Buffalo Historical Soc., Publications 1879 and 1882.
- Canada, The Old Regime in, Francis Parkman; Boston, 1874.
- Chief Justices, Lives and Times of, Henry Flanders; Philadelphia, 1881.
- Constitution, History of the, Geo. T. Curtis; N. Y., 1854.
- Constitutions, The Federal and State, etc., B. F. Poore; Washington, 1878.
- Constitutional History of the United States, H. von Holst; Chicago, 1889.
- Congressional Documents, Washington.
- Critical Period of American History, John Fiske, Boston 1892.
- Debates in Congress, Abridgement of, T. H. Benton; N. Y., 1857.
- Debates on the Federal Constitution, Jonathan Elliot; Washington, 1836.

- Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution, edited by Jared Sparks; Boston, 1829-1836.
- Emigrants to Pennsylvania. Collection of Thirty Thousand names of, D. I. Rupp; Harrisburg, 1876.
- Federalist, H. C. Lodge's edition; N. Y. 1888.
- Financial History of the United States, Bolles, N. Y. 1885.
- Franklin, Benjamin, Life, by James Parton; N. Y. 1864.
- French Protestant Refugees, M. C. Weiss; N. Y. 1854. (Translation.)
- French Settlements and Settlers in Rhode Island, Potter; Providence, 1789. (Now published as No. 5 of R. I. Historical Tracts.)
- Forum, The, April, 1894.
- Gallatin, Albert, Life by H. Adams, Phil.
- Gallatin, Albert, Writings, edited by H. Adams; Phil. 1879.
- Garfield, James A., Works edited by B. A. Hinsdale; Boston, 1882.
- Genealogical Notes of New York and New England families, S. V. Talcott; Albany, 1883.
- Hamilton, Alexander, Life by W. G. Sumner; N. Y. 1890.
- Hamilton, Alexander, Life by H. C. Lodge, Boston; and N. Y., 1892.
- Hamilton, Alexander, Life by J. T. Morse; Boston, 1876.
- Hamilton, Alexander, Works, edited by J. C. Hamilton; N. Y. 1851.
- Hamilton, Alexander, Works, edited by H. C. Lodge, N. Y., 1885.
- Hartford Convention, History of, Theo. Dwight; N. Y., 1833.
- Historical Magazine; Boston, Morrisiana, 1857-1869.
- Huguenots in France and America, H. F. Lee; Cambridge, 1843.
- Huguenots on the Hackensack, Demarest; New Brunswick, N. J., 1886.
- Huguenot Emigration to America, C. W. Baird; N. Y., 1885.
- Huguenot Society of America, Proceeding; N. Y., 1889-1891.
- Huguenot Society of America, Collections; N. Y. 1886.
- Huguenot Society of South Carolina, Transactions; Charleston, 1889-1894.

- Illinois in the Eighteenth Century, Edward G. Mason; Chicago, 1887. (Fergus Hist. Tracts, No. 12. It contains three papers read before the Chicago Hist. Soc.; and its Parish Records; Old Fort Chartres; Kaskaskia and Col. John Todd's Record Book.)
- Illinois, Pioneer History of; Reynolds; Belleville, 1852.
- Indiana Gazetteer; Indianapolis, 1849.
- Jay, John, Life and Writings by Wm. Jay; N. Y., 1833.
- Jay, John, Life by Pellew; Boston, 1890.
- Jay, John, Correspondence and Public Papers; edited by Henry P. Johnston; N. Y., 1890.
- Jefferson, Thomas, Life by Henry S. Randall; N. Y., 1858.
- Jefferson, Thomas, Writings; Washington, 1853.
- Journal of the Federal Convention, (Madison's, edited by E. H. Scott); Chicago, 1893.
- Journals of Congress; Washington, 1823.
- John Hopkins University Studies; Baltimore.
- Laurens, John, Army Correspondence of, 1777-1778; (Bradford Club Series No. 7.); N. Y. 1867.
- Local Constitutional History of the U. S., George E. Howard; Extra Vol. IV., J. H. U. Studies; Baltimore, 1889.
- Louisiana, History of, (The American Domination), Charles Gayarre, N. Y., 1886.
- Louisiana, Views of, H. M. Brackenridge; Pittsburg, 1814.
- Louisiana, Hist. Coll. of; N. Y., 1846-1853.
- Louisiana, The Story of, Maurice Thompson; Boston, 1888.
- Louisiana, History of, Barbe Marbois; Phil., 1830.
- Loyalists of the American Revolution, Lorenzo Sabine; Boston, 1864.
- Magazine of American History; N. Y., 1877.
- Massachusetts Bay, History of from 1628 to 1774, Thomas Hutchinson; Boston, 1767-1774.
- Massachusetts Hist. Soc. Collections; Boston.
- Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections; Lansing, 1877.
- Michigan, Political History of, James V. Campbell; Detroit, 1876.
- Michigan, History of, C. R. Tuttle; Detroit, 1874.
- Michigan, The Red Book of, Charles Lanman; Detroit, 1871.
- Michigan Biographies, compiled by S. D. Bingham, Lansing, 1888.

- Morris, Gouverneur. Life and Writings. Jared Sparks; Boston, 1832.
- Morris, Gouverneur. Diary and Letters. edited by Anne Cary Morris; N. Y. 1888.
- Morris, Gouverneur. Life. by Theodore Roosevelt. Boston, 1892.
- My Own Times. Reynolds; — 1855.
- Narrative and Critical History of America. edited by Justin Winsor; Boston, 1888.
- National Magazine; N. Y.. 1891.
- New England. History of, J. G. Palfrey; Boston, 1858-1878.
- New England Hist. and Gen. Register; Boston, 1847.
- New England, Federalism. Documents relating to. edited by Henry Adams; Boston, 1877.
- New York, Political History of, Jabez Hammond; Albany, 1842.
- New York, Memorial History of, edited by J. G. Wilson; N. Y., 1892.
- New York, Documentary History of; Albany, 1849.
- New York, Documents relating to the Colonial History of; Albany, 1856.
- New Jersey Archives; Newark 1880.
- Niles' Weekly Register; Baltimore, 1811.
- North Carolina, Sketches of Western. C. L. Hunter; Raleigh, 1877.
- North American Review; Vol. CXXII.
- Notes on the Early Settlement of the Northwest. Jacob Burnett; N. Y., 1847.
- Officers of the Continental Army during the War of the Revolution; Historical Register of, compiled by F. B. Heitman of the War Dept.; Washington, 1893.
- Ohio, Rufus King; Boston, 1888.
- Ohio, Caleb Atwater; Cincinnati, 1838.
- Ohio, The State of, Sources of her Strength. (Western Reserve Hist. and Arch Tracts, No. 55.) Chas. Whitelsey; Cleveland, 1881.
- Old Northwest, B. A. Hinsdale; N. Y., 1888.
- Oxford, Mass., History of, Daniels; Oxford, Mass., 1892.
- Puritan. The, in England, Holland, and America, Douglas Campbell; N. Y. 1892.

-
- Randolph Co., Ill., History of; Phil. 1883.
- Revere, Col. Paul, Life of. E. H. Goss; Boston. 1891.
- Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Commemoration of, Bicentenary of; N. Y. 1886.
- Rhode Island Colonial Records; Providence. 1856.
- Slavery in Illinois. Hist. Sketch of the Early Movement for Legalizing, Wm. H. Brown; Chicago, 1865.
- Slavery and Anti-Slavery, Wm. Goodell; N. Y.
- Slave Power in America, The Rise and Fall of, Henry Wilson; N. Y., 1872.
- Slavery, Views on American, taken a century ago; Phil., 1858. (From the writings of Anthony Benezet and John Wesley).
- South Carolina Hist., Collections; N. Y., 1836.
- St. Clair Co., Ill., History of; Phil., 1881.
- St. Clair Papers, edited by W. H. Smith; Cincinnati. 1882.
- St. Louis, History of from the Earliest Time, J. T. Scharf; Phil., 1883.
- St. Louis, Annals of in its Early Days, Fred. E. Billon; St. Louis, 1886.
- Supreme Court of the United States, The, H. L. Carson; Phil. 1891.
- Tennessee, History of, James Phelan; Boston and N. Y., 1888.
- Ulster Hist. Soc. Collections; Kingston, 1860.
- United States, History of the, Geo. Bancroft; Boston. 1876.
- United States, History of the, Richard Hildreth; N. Y. 1879.
- United States, History of the, James Schouler; Washington, 1889.
- Vincennes, Colonial History of, John Law; Vincennes, 1858.
- Virginia Hist. Soc. Collections; Richmond, 1882.
- Virginia, Old Churches and Families of, Mead; Phil., 1878.
- Virginie, Histoire De La, Robt. Beverly; Amsterdam, 1777.
- View of the Climate and Soil of the United States of America, C. F. Volney; London, 1804.
- War of 1812, History of, C. J. Ingersoll; Phil.; 1853.
- Washington, George, The Writings of, edited by W. C. Ford; N. Y., 1891.
- Webster, Daniel, Great Speeches of, edited by E. P. Whipple; Boston.

West, The. Robert P. Porter; Chicago, 1882.
Winning of the West. Theodore Roosevelt; N. Y., 1889.
Wisconsin Hist. Soc. Collections; Madison, 1855.






JOURNAL OBSERVER PRINT,
REDFIELD. S. D.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 464 798 6





Copies of this Thesis may be obtained by addressing Elizabeth H. Avery, Redfield College, Redfield, South Dakota.
Price 50 cts.

